

JPRS 79919

22 January 1982

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1213

Selections from Soviet Foreign Policy Journals



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

22 January 1982

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS
No. 1213

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS

CONTENTS

Kosukhin on Spread of Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Africa (N. Kosukhin; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 7, Jul 1981)	1
Analysis of Ideological Trends in Developing Countries (L. Polonskaya; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 10, Oct 1981)	10
Limits on Shifts to Right in U.S. Domestic Policy Analyzed (Aleksey Aronovich Popov; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 5, Sep-Oct 1981)	19
U.S.-Soviet Symposium on Crisis of Capitalism, Working Class (RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 5, Sep-Oct 1981)	27
U.S., PRC Attempts To Undermine Non-Aligned Movement Condemned (Vladimir Kotlyarov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, No 6, Nov-Dec 1981)	37
U.S. Campaign Against Terrorism Veils Aggressive Policies (Vasili Yefremov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, No 6, Nov-Dec 1981)	42
Role of State in Economies of Socialist Oriented Countries (Gleb Smirnov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, No 6, Nov-Dec 1981)	46
Gromyko Addresses Conference on African Liberation Struggle (Anatoliy Gromyko; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, No 6, Nov-Dec 1981)	50
Book Analyzes Ties Between U.S., PRC, Japan (V. Tikhomirov, ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, No 6, Nov-Dec 1981)	52

KOSUKHIN ON SPREAD OF MARXIST-LENINIST IDEAS IN AFRICA

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 7, Jul 81 pp 2-5

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Kosukhin: "Spread of the Ideas of Scientific Socialism in Africa"]

[Text] A distinguishing feature of the current era is the powerful sweep of revolutionary acts and the realization by the broad people's masses of the historical necessity for the replacement of capitalism with socialism. New generations, social strata, parties and organizations are turning to the ideas of socialism. "There is no country or group of countries," L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said at the 26th party congress, "and no ideological or political current which has not experienced the influence of socialism to this extent or the other."

These words also apply in full to Africa, where a process of the combination of scientific socialism with the national liberation movement--a process meriting careful study and analysis--is under way.

It is known from the history of the revolutionary movement that the working people of each country assimilate Marxism-Leninism in different forms and at different times. The French, F. Engels wrote, have assimilated Marxism politically, "taking as the point of departure the demand for political freedom and equality" and arriving at demands for "social freedom and social equality." The Germans "became communists philosophically." The British came to Marxism "practically, as a consequence of the rapid growth of poverty and demoralization and pauperism in their own country."¹ Russia, in V.I. Lenin's words, achieved Marxism through the experience of the class struggle.²

How is the spread and assimilation of the ideas of scientific socialism proceeding in Africa?

Following the victory of the world's first socialist revolution, there was opened to the colonial and at that time dependent peoples the possibility in principle of avoiding the period of the domination of capitalist relations and bourgeois ideology corresponding thereto. In our day this possibility is increasingly becoming a reality. The Great October and the embodiment of its principles in the world socialist community and the activity of the Marxist-Leninist parties of the capitalist countries represented a most important political and ideological prerequisite of the spread of the ideas of socialism in the zone of the national liberation movement.

Formerly a great deal of work on the propaganda of these ideas in Africa was performed by the Communist International and its sections, including the communist parties of the metropolis. Thus in the Maghreb countries local sections of the French Communist Party emerged from which the communist parties of Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco subsequently grew, and in the countries of Tropical Africa, groups for studying the principles of scientific socialism. Many prominent figures of Africa's national liberation and workers' movement underwent ideological-theoretical conditioning in the Communist University of the Oriental Working People, which had been created in Moscow.

Communists--members of legal or illegal communist parties; Marxists--members of circles and groups which are not a part of other parties, including the revolutionary-democratic parties even; Marxists operating within the framework of revolutionary-democratic parties and, in certain cases, occupying high state office; and representatives of revolutionary democracy who have assimilated scientific-socialist ideology in the process of the delineation of forces within its ranks as the national liberation struggle extends and also as the result of political studies are currently the purveyors of the ideology of scientific socialism on the continent.

Active propaganda of Marxist-Leninist teaching is being performed by the communist and workers' parties. The South African Communist Party, the oldest on the continent, which celebrated its 60th anniversary on 30 June 1981, is operating under the most difficult underground conditions. Its theoretical and information organ, AFRICAN COMMUNIST, is disseminated in many African countries. In South Africa itself, as Moses Mabida, general secretary of the South African Communist Party, declared at the 26th CPSU Congress, "the initiative is gradually passing to the hands of the working class and the people's masses, whose struggle for their inalienable right to national self-determination has reached unprecedented proportions," which testifies to the increased influence of the South African Communist Party and the country's revolutionary-democratic forces.

African Marxist-Leninists are tirelessly continuing the multifaceted work on enlisting the working strata of the population on the side of the ideology of scientific socialism.³

By virtue of the socioeconomic backwardness of African society, socialist ideas were initially combined highly fancifully there with a variety of traditional, petit bourgeois and national notions. African leaders claimed the creation of their own "philosophy of revolution" and a so-called African ideology which was allegedly free of the ideological influences of real socialism and capitalism. The fact that pre-capitalist social relations were predominant in Africa served as an important argument for them.

After independence was achieved, anticolonial nationalism in very many countries gave way to the petit bourgeois currents of "national-type socialism," "African socialism," and so forth. "Socialism in this variety or the other has become the leading ideology of nationalist leaders," the American sociologist B. Shafer observed.⁴

The socialist alternative, at times understood in a highly distinctive manner and interpreted quite variously, represented for a whole number of African leaders the sole path of their peoples' extrication from backwardness and poverty.

The experience of development soon showed, however, that "African socialism" in practice is the establishment of a capitalist type of economy connected with neocolonialism. Such a trend, which had discredited itself in Africans' eyes, could no longer remain a banner for them and serve the cause of the continent's progress.

Progressive representatives of revolutionary democracy unleashed an ideological struggle against the pseudosocialist concepts which contributed to the further dissociation of the revolutionary-democratic forces from petit bourgeois Utopian ideas. The "crisis" of African socialism accelerated the evolution of social thought in the direction of scientific socialism and the development of revolutionary-democratic ideology.

The social choice became the principal issue of the political thought of the contemporary national liberation movement. Revolutionary democrats--the leaders of the mass movement of the peasantry, working class and patriotic circles of the intelligentsia and the middle strata--put forward an anti-imperialist and anticapitalist program of the emerging countries' development under socialist slogans.⁵

Initially revolutionary democracy was characterized by a ~~subjective perception~~ of scientific socialism. Socialism was often viewed merely as a method of liquidating the consequences of colonialism and as the path of national revival and not as an integral scientific world outlook, a teaching on the revolutionary transformation of society and a qualitatively new method of production.

With the passage of time the experience and logic of political struggle brought the progressive part of revolutionary democracy close to a scientific comprehension of the essence of the contemporary era and Marxist-Leninist theory as a determining factor of social transformations. Revolutionary democrats now see scientific socialism as a theory capable not only of becoming the world outlook of the broad working people's masses but also of providing them with a realistic program of the building of a new, progressive society. Whereas originally revolutionary democracy was particularly attracted by the political aspect of Marxism, at the present stage of the national liberation movement the economic teaching of scientific socialism is just as important for it.

Under current conditions revolutionary-democratic ideology is preparing the ground for the spread of scientific socialism among broad strata of the working people and facilitating this task, representing a unique preparatory stage on the way to the assimilation of Marxist-Leninist ideology. But it is also true that in a number of instances revolutionary-democratic ideology has not shed nationalist accretions inasmuch as the mass consciousness still lags behind the development of the national-democratic revolution.

Revolutionary democrats have come to an understanding and acceptance of Marxist-Leninist theory by various paths. From this viewpoint they may provisionally be divided into three groups.

The liberation fighters who experienced the influence of the ideas of Marxist-Leninism and were formed under their influence before the start of Africa's broad decolonization belong in the first.

The second group includes those who initiated revolutionary activity or came to power even without any integral social orientation and evolved from anti-imperialist nationalism to an understanding of the objective nature of social phenomena in the process of the national liberation movement and study of the logic and lessons of revolution.

The third group (let us provisionally call those whom it includes the "second generation of revolutionaries") made the acquaintance of Marxist-Leninist ideology under progressive regimes, as schoolchildren or students. Many of these people consider themselves communists or Marxists. The representatives of this group usually occupy positions in the middle tier of the party-state machinery and, in certain countries, leading positions.

According to the American scholar C. Potholm, "the contemporary political climate in Africa is reason to believe that for many African ruling groups Marxism and revolutionary theory have perfectly definite and increasingly great magnetic force."⁶

Amplification is needed here: Marx's theory has become not merely a magnetic force but one which is directly influencing the course of African states' social development. Despite the fact that Marxism-Leninism is just one of the sources of the ideology of the revolutionary democrats, its influence frequently proves decisive in the formation of their ideological-political views and their adoption of practical decisions.

The turn of revolutionary democracy's left wing toward the ideology of scientific socialism which occurred at the end of the 1960's and the start of the 1970's was reflected in the nature of the national-democratic revolution, in which considerable space was occupied by questions of the working people's social liberation. Marxist-Leninist theory was embodied in the practice of the countries of a socialist orientation, where a struggle is being waged not only against imperialist oppression but also against all forms of man's exploitation of man--both feudal and capitalist.

The CPSU Central Committee Report to the 26th party congress noted the increase in the number of states of a socialist orientation which had opted for the path of socialist development. On the African continent this group includes Algeria, Angola, Benin, Guinea, Congo, Madagascar, Mozambique, Tanzania, Ethiopia and other countries, which account for more than one-third of the territory and approximately one-fourth of the population of Africa. This is yet further striking evidence that the current era is that of man's transition from capitalism to socialism.

Revolutionary democracy's evolution in the direction of scientific socialism, certain of whose ideas and methods it is endeavoring to apply to the solution of acute socioeconomic problems of its own countries, is occurring in a bitter confrontation with a variety of left- and right-opportunist, nationalist trends. "For the world and, particularly, for the African revolutionary movement," Samora Machel, chairman of the FRELIMO Party, emphasized, "particular significance is now attached to proving in practice that the orientation toward Marxism-Leninism is not the result of 'imported ideas' but the conscious result of the struggle of the oppressed peoples and classes for their liberation. It would also seem important here to demonstrate that the theory of scientific communism is not dogma but a live teaching constantly enriched by the practice of the world revolutionary movement."⁷

The spread of the scientific-socialist world outlook in the liberated countries means the start of a qualitatively new stage in the development of the national-democratic revolution in Africa and an increase in its ideological armament. But at this stage it also has its difficulties connected primarily with the absence of a broad independent workers' movement and the underdevelopment of social differentiation and the class struggle.

V.I. Lenin wrote that "in all countries there has been a period when the workers' movement and socialism existed separately from each other and proceeded along a particular path--and in all countries this separation has led to the weakness of socialism and the workers' movement; in all countries only the unification of socialism with the workers' movement has created a firm foundation both for the one and for the other. But in each country this unification of socialism with the workers' movement has developed historically and developed by a special path, depending on the conditions of place and time."⁸

The process of the unification of scientific socialism with the workers' movement and the activeness of other working people's strata in the countries of a socialist orientation where communist parties are lacking is occurring in two stages.

The first consists of the working people's perception of the ideas of scientific socialism, which are brought to the masses by representatives of the revolutionary-democratic parties, who in this volume or the other adopt the principles of Marxism-Leninism. "The proclamation of socialism as the guiding principle of our revolution," Mengistu Haile Mariam, chairman of Ethiopia's Provisional Military Administrative Council, declared, "has created favorable conditions for the dissemination and study of scientific socialism. This has facilitated the translation of Marxist-Leninist literature into our languages and thereby contributed to a rise in the people's political awareness."⁹

Ideological-educational activity is aimed at the establishment of revolutionary-democratic ideology as the prevailing system of views and the liberation of the people's masses from traditional forms of thinking. A reassessment of values is under way, and the traditional views on life are either gradually becoming meaningless or being adapted to society's new requirements. But inasmuch as the spread of scientific socialism has not been triggered by the high level of African countries' economic, social and cultural development, this process is proceeding in contradictory manner: the new ideas, albeit corresponding to the social feelings of the working people's masses, are coming into conflict with their actual experience of life and thought and behavioral stereotypes.

This stage is also typical of the present day in certain countries.

The second stage arrives in line with the further rapprochement of revolutionary democracy with the positions of the working class and the former's assimilation of the ideas of scientific socialism. Revolutionary-democratic ideology is linked increasingly closely with the program postulates of Marxism-Leninism, which is ultimately connected with the conversion of revolutionary-democratic parties into parties of vanguard of the working class and peasantry.

A particular feature of the propaganda of scientific socialism in Angola, Benin, Congo, Mozambique, Ethiopia and certain other countries is the fact that it is performed by the ruling parties, which have proclaimed the ideology of Marxism-Leninism the ideological basis of their policy and regard it as a most important subjective factor of forward movement along the path of a socialist orientation.

In the course of these countries' noncapitalist development new prerequisites are created for the unification of scientific socialism with the revolutionary struggle and creative labor of the people. A scientific-socialist world outlook is formed as the two-in-one process of the theoretical assimilation of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the political education system and the secondary and higher educational institutions and the practical implementation of these ideas.

Tremendous significance for the African revolutionaries is attached to the international activity of the socialist community countries and the policy of the CPSU and the fraternal parties aimed at support for the national liberation movement in every possible way. "The MPLA-Labor Party and the entire Angolan people value Soviet people's solidarity highly," Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the MPLA-Labor Party and president of the People's Republic of Angola, declared from the platform of the 26th CPSU Congress.¹⁰ The overseas guests emphasized the most important role of CPSU congresses in the development of the theory and practice of the revolutionary movement and their influence on all the world's progressive forces.

The very orientation toward socialism demands the creative application by the revolutionary democrats of the experience of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist community countries, in whose example they clearly see, in F. Engels' words, "how it is done."¹¹ The adoption of Marxism-Leninism as the party and state ideology helps to a considerable extent in the surmounting of ideological differences within revolutionary democracy, dissociation from opportunist currents and the formulation of a strategy around which the best representatives of the progressive forces rally.

At the same time the appeal to scientific socialism may sometimes have as a consequence proclamation of the immediate transition to socialism. But this, however, does not, of course, automatically solve the problems of the efficient development of the national economy and the surmounting of the working people's low living standard. The illusion of the lack of fundamental differences between the general democratic and socialist tasks of the revolution is explained by the insufficient development of class relations. The politically uneducated masses at times link the "socialism" concept with the immediate removal of poverty and the arrival of abundance and "paradise" on earth. Such sentiments are frequently supported in the statements of revolutionary democrats, who point out that socialism may be implemented at any level of development of the production forces--even on the basis of the African traditional commune. Such interpretations conceal the serious danger of socialist ideals, which are realized only as a result of persistent and difficult struggle, selfless labor and the creation of a qualitatively new method of production, being compromised.

The problem of an evaluation of the current stage of the national-democratic revolution is not only of theoretical but also, primarily, practical significance. In identifying a noncapitalist path of development with the direct building of socialism there arises the illusion of the possibility of skipping over the inevitable

intermediary stages of social development and an inclination to pursue a policy excluding these social forces or the other which objectively retain revolutionary potentialities.

The radical transformations being implemented in the countries of a socialist orientation contain a socialist tendency or create the conditions for its subsequent emergence and development. The program documents adopted by the revolutionary-democratic parties of the 1970's take account of the need for transitional stages and forms on the path of the building of a new society, which signifies a qualitatively new feature of African revolutionary democracy. Thus the Declaration on the Party's General Line and the Stages of the Benin Revolution, which was adopted at the First Extraordinary Benin People's Revolution Party Congress in May 1976, divides the revolution in the country into three stages distinguished by aims and content and following one another in the following sequence: the revolutionary movement for national liberation; the national-democratic revolution; and the socialist revolution.¹²

The creation of vanguard parties of the working people guided by scientific-socialist ideology has become or is becoming a fundamentally important factor of the ideological-political life of a number of African countries of a socialist orientation (Angola, Benin, Congo, Mozambique, Ethiopia). A fundamental turnabout in respect of revolutionary democracy toward Marxism-Leninism and the possibilities of its creative application under specific African conditions has been manifested here.

The vanguard parties which are taking shape have come close to Marxist-Leninist parties in their long-term goals, program principles, ideological basis and principles of practical activity. At the same time the traditional-tribal and petit bourgeois illusions of the working class, peasantry and, to a considerable extent, of the revolutionary intelligentsia are holding back the conversion of these parties into a truly revolutionary-transformatory force. What is required at this stage is tremendous ideological-political work directly among party members and their increased consciousness and assertiveness. At the same time there arises the danger of the appearance of elements of a sectarian policy with respect to the broad working people's masses and the vanguard being divorced from its social basis.

In this connection importance is attached to the creation everywhere of primary party organizations, which are the foundation of an active political organization. Being connected with the ordinary workers, they serve as the conduits of the ideology, program goals and tasks of the party and are called upon, in the apt definition of Jose Eduardo dos Santos, "to convert the workers from potential Marxists into convinced Marxists who are guided by this teaching in practical activity."¹³

However, in real life the role of the local elements of the vanguard parties and their ordinary members is as yet manifestly inadequate. The main impediment on the path of an increase therein is general socioeconomic backwardness, the inadequate numbers of the working class, the lack of the necessary contingent of trained party personnel and so forth.

The process of the coming into being of ruling parties with a scientific-socialist ideology in the countries of noncapitalist development--parties reflecting the new stage of the ideological-political evolution of revolutionary democracy, its transition to the standpoints of the working class and its perception of Marxist-Leninist theory--is highly complex and contradictory.

As we have already said, the spread of scientific socialism encounters the strong resistance of traditional-commune and nationalistic views. The surmounting of archaic prejudices is a painstaking and delicate business and cannot fail to take quite a long time, while an endeavor to artificially accelerate it is fraught with results which are the opposite of those anticipated.

Rightwing nationalists are speculating on the objectively inevitable difficulties of the economic development of the countries of a socialist orientation and attempting to use for their own narrow mercenary purposes the nationalistic elements in the world outlook of certain revolutionary-democratic leaders to undermine their progressive course.

The liquidation of the institutions inherited from colonialism and the policy of limiting the exploiter classes and strata are gradually depriving traditional and bourgeois ideology of its active purveyors and conduits, and the very social foundation of these views is being eroded. This process will proceed more successfully as the national working class and revolutionary intelligentsia take shape and their ideological-political level rises. The incomprehension of the essence of Marxist-Leninist theory, the primitive notions about socialism and the vulgarization of its principles which are sometimes observed even among sincere revolutionaries, particularly in the masses, will also recede into the past.

A most salutary role in this respect is being performed by the development and strengthening of the comprehensive relations of the young states which are headed by revolutionary-democratic parties with the socialist community and the world communist movement.

Under current conditions the revolutionary democrats are largely tackling the important task which V.I. Lenin set the oriental communists, speaking of the need "to translate the true communist teaching, which is intended for the communists of more advanced countries, into the language of each people...."¹⁴

The further spread and intensification of the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism and the consistent application of its principles in the practical building of the new life will contribute to the consolidation of the socialist orientation and to an irreversible nature being imparted to it in each country which has embarked on this path.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 1, pp 525-526.
2. See V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Works], vol 41, p 8.
3. For more detail see P.I. Manchkha, "Aktual'nyye problemy sovremennoy Afriki" [Topical Problems of Contemporary Africa], Moscow, 1979, pp 185-254.
4. B.S. Shafer, "Faces of Nationalism. New Realities and Old Myths," New York, 1972, p 302.

5. For more detail see N.D. Kosukhin, "Formirovaniye ideyno-politicheskoy strategii v afrikanskikh stranakh sotsialisticheskoy orientatsii" [Formation of Ideological-Political Strategy in the African Countries of a Socialist Orientation], Moscow, 1980: "Ideologiya revolyutsionnykh demokratov Afriki" [Ideology of Africa's Revolutionary Democrats], Moscow, 1981.
6. Christian P. Potholm, "The Theory and Practice of African Politics," Englewood Cliffs, New York, 1979, p 243.
7. "Documents of the FRELIMO Party of the People's Republic of Mozambique. Third Congress. Maputo, 3-7 February 1977", Moscow, 1980, pp 3-4.
8. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 4, p 373.
9. PRAVDA 5 May 1977.
10. PRAVDA 27 February 1981.
11. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 22, p 446.
12. For more detail see S. Rozanova, "Benin's Resolve," AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 6, 1978.
13. JORNAL DE ANGOLA, Luanda, 8 January 1980.
14. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 39, p 330.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1981. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatel'stva "Nauka"

8850

CSO: 1807/21

ANALYSIS OF IDEOLOGICAL TRENDS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 10, Oct 81 pp 2-5

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences L. Polonskaya: "The Emerging Countries: Main Directions of Ideological Struggle"]

[Text] Ideological struggle has continued in the emerging countries at the start of the 1980's both over problems which appeared in preceding years and over new directions which have reflected the structural shifts which are occurring in these countries. In particular, there has been a strengthening of the trends of retraditionalization, which have been manifested most strikingly in the events in Iran. The unacceptability of Western models of modernization for transitional multiple-structure societies is reflected here. The collation of the experience of Asian and African countries' experience and the new trends of their development contained in the material of the 26th CPSU Congress plays a paramount part in the analysis of the said processes. The CPSU Central Committee Report emphasizes the significance of the preservation of the group of emerging countries as a historical community (it is not fortuitous that their characterization is allocated a special section in the report) and records their further differentiation. At the same time the significance of the similarity of the main development trends along a progressive path of the countries of a socialist orientation is revealed.

Historical experience shows that the differences between the countries of a socialist orientation and countries where capitalist relations have been established are intensifying not only in the sphere of economics and politics but also in the sphere of ideology. Traditional spiritual values are being transformed, the correlation between the evolved bourgeois and petit bourgeois currents is changing and the differences between the ideological standpoints of the forces of a socialist orientation and the defenders of the bourgeois development model are intensifying. At the same time, as pointed out by the scientific conference "Joint Struggle of the Workers' and National Liberation Movements Against Imperialism and for Social Progress" which was held in October last year in Berlin, it is necessary to take into account the fact that the imperialist propaganda campaign is having an impact on certain circles in the developing countries. It enjoys the increasingly active support of internal reaction and influential privileged groups in these countries.

The process of ideological delineation is occurring extremely unevenly, as is formational-class delineation as a whole. The general regularities of this process at

the current stage of development, which have been noted in recently published articles by G. F. Kim, Ye. M. Primakov and N.A. Simoniya,* naturally also extend to the ideological sphere. As N.A. Simoniya rightly emphasizes, the emerging countries are simultaneously tackling tasks of different formational periods and different phases of development: the transition from prebourgeois to bourgeois relations, the formation of independent national societies and the inclusion of these countries in a broader formational community--capitalism or socialism--and, finally, integration within the framework of one of these systems. "We are witnessing the overlapping of the three phases on top of one another," the author emphasizes.

The coexistence of highly contradictory trends can be observed in the sphere of ideological-political struggle. Thus together with the continuing polarization of the bourgeois and revolutionary-democratic ideologies a broad spectrum of national-democratic currents of the narodnik-populist type uniting the masses of the petite bourgeoisie and the nonproletarian laboring strata is preserved. The rapprochement of the ideological standpoints of the most consistent revolutionary democrats with scientific socialism and the formation of a proletarian ideology on the one hand and the evolution of bourgeois ideologies which on a number of fundamental issues (primarily the negative attitude toward scientific socialism) are drawing increasingly close to the bourgeois ideology of the capitalist Western countries on the other are occurring right before our eyes. At the same time we can observe the preservation and, in certain cases, the resuscitation of traditional ideological relations vertically and horizontally and the camouflaging of the processes of class differentiation by traditional forms of ideology. Indicative, for example, is the at first sight surprising renaissance of the "revival of Islam" movement, within whose framework trends of integration on a traditional basis and disintegration on a social-class basis coexist.

Such movements play an important part in the current ideological-political struggle. The differences in their essence and social thrust were revealed in the CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th CPSU Congress. "The liberation struggle may be developed under the banner of Islam. The experience of history, including the most recent, testifies to this. But, on the other hand, it indicates that reaction also operates with Islamic slogans, raising counterrevolutionary rebellions. Consequently, it is entirely a matter of the actual content of this movement or the other."

A most important specific feature of the ideological situation at the frontier of the 1980's is the exacerbation of the struggle between revolution and counter-revolution for influencing the petit bourgeois and nonproletarian laboring strata. This circumstance is triggering the extensive dissemination of ideas reflecting the interests and sentiments of the said strata. These ideas (and it has to be emphasized, moreover, that it is a question both of conservative and radical notions)

*Ye. M. Primakov, "The Emerging Countries: Problems of Community," NARODY AZII I AFRIKI No 5, 1980; N.A. Simoniya, "Current Stage of the Liberation Struggle," AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 5, 1981; and G.I. [sic] Kim, "The National Liberation Movement at the Current Stage," MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN' No 3, 1981.

are also being incorporated increasingly often in the official political concepts of different ruling regimes of the emerging countries where capitalist relations have been established. The thickening of the "patina of petit bourgeoisism" is directly connected with the fact that the incapacity of the official ideologies oriented toward "Westernization from above" to ensure society's consolidation and the state's political stability has been manifested distinctly at the frontier of the 1980's.

The need for the broadening and strengthening of the social base of a number of ruling regimes has become perfectly obvious under the conditions of political crises. Whereas the "Westernization from above" concepts were geared to the solution of all problems of the social development of the emerging countries primarily by way of "economic growth," the ideas of petit bourgeois "economic romanticism" oriented toward preservation of the specific features of national social structures are currently being advanced to the forefront increasing frequently.

With the exception of the most reactionary neocomprador groupings, a large part of the national bourgeoisie of the emerging countries still retains its contradictions with imperialism and, consequently, is capable on a number of questions of the anti-imperialist struggle of acting together with petit bourgeois politicians from common ideological standpoints (within the framework of the nonaligned movement, in the struggle for a new economic order and so forth). In the countries which are less developed in a socioeconomic respect and in which feudal vestiges are preserved bourgeois ideology is also characterized by a certain antifeudal potential.

Simultaneously with the appearance of the socialist development alternative national interests increasingly contradict the class interests of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie's preserved generally democratic potentialities are reflected in liberal-type theories, the counterrevolutionary trend in conservative-type theories. A distinguishing feature of the latter is anticommunism. They are characterized here by an endeavor to broaden the social base of this movement or the other by way of use of the conservative aspects of petit bourgeois ideology and mentality.

Until recently conservative theories proved the proposition that although communism was engendered by the West's development, the true essence of Western democracy is alien to it. Account is now taken of the anti-West sentiments, for which both the ideas of a socialist orientation and the ideology of real socialism are served up by reactionary ideologists as variants of Western development, which is of the same model as imperialism and unacceptable for Asian and African countries. Thus anti-communism is arbitrarily presented as criticism of the "Western variant" of development.

The presence of contradictions between the emerging countries and imperialism is not denied in the majority of conservative-type concepts, but they are assessed as being nonantagonistic. The proposed paths of the solution of these contradictions vary. Some concepts prove the need for "cooperation" and "coparticipation," others emphasize the advantages of "isolation" from the Western world.

There has been a pronounced increase in bourgeois concepts of the conservative type of the role of the following prevalent argument: the idea that all social conflicts in society can be resolved employing traditional institutions

is propagandized in every possible way. Thus, for example, the orientation of official propaganda toward "Hindu values" was a distinguishing feature of the ideology of the Janata Party which came to power under the conditions of political crisis in India (1977-1979).

The departure of bourgeois regimes from the policy of "Westernization from above" and an endeavor to use traditional institutions can be observed most distinctly in the so-called Muslim countries. The official propaganda of Zia ul-Haq in Pakistan, which parades "Islamization from above" as a means of the solution of social conflicts and the removal of political tension, may serve as a striking example of such a policy. The orientation toward traditional relations is also characteristic of certain foreign policy concepts which have become prevalent recently. Thus the ideological-political standpoints of a number of conservative regimes in countries which have come to possess a considerable number of "petrodollars" are characterized by an endeavor to substantiate claims to their own leadership with the aid of the "Islamic factor". The spread of the ideas of "Islamic solidarity"--a movement which has bestirred itself markedly at the frontier of the 1980's--is, inter alia, evidence of this. These ideas are taken up by the forces of reaction and have a clearly expressed anticommunist thrust (the ideology of the Afghan counterrevolution may serve as an example). However, they are also being used by radical bourgeois and petit bourgeois theorists (the slogan of jihad--the Muslims' holy war for their faith--in the struggle against imperialism and Israeli aggression) at the same time. The appeal to traditional concepts facilitates the influence of bourgeois ideology on the petit bourgeois masses. They are employed extensively in the conservative-type concepts for unification of reactionary forces under the banner of counterrevolution.

The differentiation of the conservative-type ideological currents is intensifying at the frontier of the 1980's. Some champion the path of bourgeois development which is oriented toward compromise with the feudal and semifeudal elements in their country and the prolonged preservation of prebourgeois structures. Others, on the other hand, advocate more profound social transformations, but substantiate here the inevitability and expediency of their country's peripheral development dependent on the West.

As far as influence on the revolutionary process of liberal-type bourgeois ideologies is concerned, it is determined by the erosion of the boundaries between the liberal and conservative currents on the one hand and between the bourgeois and petit bourgeois on the other. In both the liberal and conservative concepts an important place is occupied by technical-economic issues, with which the implementation of the theories of "economic growth" and the solution of social problems are connected. However, whereas in the conservative ideologies in the recent past the technical-economic aspect suppressed all the others, in the liberal ideologies it was merely one of the components. At the same time liberal ideologists have not revealed at the frontier of the 1980's such a feverish rush from modernization to traditionalism as the conservatives.

The problems of the emerging countries' backwardness are viewed in liberal concepts not only as a set of technical-economic issues, which characterizes the conservative concepts, but primarily as a social problem. The task of removing the poverty of the laboring masses is deemed to be paramount, and in its accomplishment, furthermore,

liberal-type bourgeois ideologists frequently declare the need to turn to the experience of socialism. At the same time, however, anticommunist features also are inherent in such concepts. Thus as distinct from the petit bourgeois ideological currents, bourgeois-liberal-type political concepts, although incorporating a number of general democratic principles, are aimed at preventing the independent revolutionary activeness of the masses with the aid of political compromises and the combination of authoritarian methods with parliamentary-democratic methods.

Whereas the endeavor to limit monopoly ownership, the orientation toward development of the state sector and other general democratic ideas bring the official liberal-type ideologies close to the petit bourgeois theories, the fear of a fundamental redistribution of wealth, a denial of the very principle of private ownership and the revolutionary activeness of the masses unites them with the conservatives.

With the intensification of the world revolutionary process an important place has been occupied by liberal-type bourgeois ideologists' development of their own concept of social revolution. The theory of "democratic revolution" (whose principles were formulated, in particular, in the 1970's in the works of Philippines President F. Marcos) has enjoyed the most popularity. This theory proceeds from the fact that social progress can be secured only by way of social changes which require a long time and unify different social processes. Its authors reveal a familiarity with the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the social revolution and incorporate certain propositions of this teaching in their outline. However, their interpretation of social changes as a whole testifies to the substitution of bourgeois reformism for social revolution.

There are particular reasons for the spread of these ideas in the latter half of the 1970's and the start of the 1980's. The more realistic the prospect of social revolution in Asian and African countries becomes, the greater the attention which is paid to the development of reformist concepts intended to limit its antibourgeois thrust. The main attention here is paid to working out development models which would be consonant with the interests and sentiments of the petite bourgeoisie. Extensive use is made for this purpose of the interpretation of real social contradictions as moral-ethical categories (the bourgeois concepts of "nonviolent revolution," "Islamic revolution" and so forth).

Thus the ideology which in countries developing along a capitalist path has up to now been the ideology of mass political opposition is exerting an ever increasing influence on the theories of the bourgeois ruling groupings, particularly those which came to power as a result of the political crises of the 1970's. The above-mentioned "patina of petitbourgeoisism" on the present-day ideological doctrines of the ruling circles of countries of a capitalist development and the superseding of bourgeois ideological currents by petit bourgeois currents is a characteristic feature of the ideological-political struggle at the frontier of the 1980's.

A new feature of the ideological situation at the end of the 1970's and the start of the 1980's was an increase in the subjective aspiration of the petty-ownership strata to ideological isolation from the bourgeoisie on the one hand and an intensification of ideological delineation within the petit bourgeoisie itself on the other. This phenomenon is connected with the gradual rapprochement of an increasingly large part of vacillating petit bourgeois democracy with revolutionary democracy,

that is, with a trend which is objectively progressive. It is blazing a trail for itself, despite all the difficulties which are being encountered on the path of the emerging countries and despite the resistance of bourgeois ideology, which is constantly nurturing the petty-ownership principle of petty bourgeois mentality. The clash of these two trends is also determining today the nature of the ideological-political struggle between the bourgeoisie and revolutionary democracy for the petty bourgeois and nonproletarian laboring strata of the population, which constitute the mass base of contemporary ideological-political movements in the Afro-Asian world.

A mood of disenchantment with the possibility of the solution of the social problems which had confronted the emerging countries solely with the aid of economic growth had spread in certain of these countries by the end of the 1970's (neither industrialization nor the "green revolution" had produced the anticipated results in this respect). Under these conditions the quest for the social ideal acquired certain new features.

Subjectively the petite bourgeoisie and nonproletarian laboring strata are concerned not simply to overcome backwardness but to improve their own position. And here the countries developing along a capitalist path encounter the need to tackle, as has already been said, tasks in at least two planes: the breakup and modernization of prebourgeois traditional structures and bourgeois development proper at the stage where a socialist alternative has emerged. And this, in turn, is giving rise to the conviction of the need for and possibility of combining and "synthesizing" in a single teaching diametrically opposite approaches to the social contradictions and methods of resolving them characteristic of different historical eras and different social classes. The elements of the community of the emerging countries and their specific features which are preserved in the minds of representatives of different social strata with their petty bourgeois social mentality are being elevated to the level of the sole regularity of their social development and counterposed to class delineation and the process of integration into the different world systems. Thus are born erroneous notions of the existence of real possibilities for development along some particular "extraformational" "third path," and the idea of the absolutization of individual countries' national specifics is spreading.

The spread of such sentiments among various petit bourgeois and nonproletarian laboring strata at the frontier of the 1980's is connected with their reaction to the bourgeois policy of modernization in accordance with the "Western model" which had been pursued in a number of Asian and African countries following their acquisition of political independence on the one hand and to the attempts of ultraleft forces to "transplant" socialism in national soil without regard for these countries' specific features on the other.

Guided by V.I. Lenin's instruction concerning the dual nature of petit bourgeois ideology and the singularities of its evolution, we must emphasize the following: while erroneous in the formal-economic sense, the "third path" development theories which have become particularly widespread at the frontier of the 1980's reflect the true interests of certain groups of the petite bourgeoisie and nonproletarian laboring strata and a definite (inevitable, evidently) stage in the development of their social consciousness. Consequently, the ideas of a noncapitalist interpretation which exist in these theories could, given favorable conditions, facilitate the transition of the ideologists and supporters of this path to revolutionary-democratic and socialist positions even.

As is known, various theories of nonproletarian "national socialism"--semifeudal, bourgeois, petit bourgeois, conservative and revolutionary-democratic--became widespread in the 1960's-1970's.

However, under the conditions of growing class delineation a differentiation of the nonproletarian strata's ideas concerning socialism and the "third path" of development can be observed. The revolutionary democrats are drawing increasingly close to a scientific understanding of socialism; at the same time many petit bourgeois ideologists have begun to avoid the very term "socialism" in any combination ("national," "religious" and so forth).

Petit bourgeois concepts are distinguished from bourgeois concepts by the defense of petty ownership and petty production, sharp criticism of large-scale private ownership and the development of concrete measures designed to prevent the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few. Essentially what we have is attempts to "combine" a defense of private ownership and recognition of the right to limit it in favor of the small-scale producer.

The differentiation between different petit bourgeois currents of countries developing by the capitalist path is manifested in the fact of which of these principles prevails.

New features of petit bourgeois ideological currents are also reflected in political theories containing a sharp criticism of the bourgeois state and substantiating its unacceptability for the emerging countries. Attempts are being made to create a model of a new type of state embodying the social ideal of the petite bourgeoisie and based on the principles of the power of the people.

An important new feature of the ideology of petit bourgeois democracy is formulation of the question of a social revolution. The question of what conditions are essential for realization of the economic and political models of the "third path" of development is being put by almost all petit bourgeois ideologists. Almost all of them recognize the need for revolution for the implementation of their social ideals and say that it is a question of a "new type" of revolution which is simultaneously anti-imperialist and anti-exploiter. The ideologists of this type of revolution are paying considerable attention to its driving forces. The majority acknowledges that it is necessary to understand by revolution only mass actions and mass movements. There can be observed in this formulation of the question not only consideration of the experience of the struggle for independence but also the impact of Marxist philosophy, which many ideologists confess.

The proposition of the peasantry as the sole revolutionary force, which was put forward in the 1960's by a whole number of petit bourgeois democrats, is of considerably less significance today. The anticapitalist accent inherent in the new theories of social revolution is bringing about a shift in the center of attention to the revolutionary activeness of all the destitute and the oppressed, including the working class and the urban masses, but only a few recognize the leading role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle. While not denying the revolutionary possibilities of the working class as a part of all the oppressed and destitute, petit bourgeois ideologists are oriented in practice to the petty-ownership and nonproletarian laboring strata and see in this distinction of the "new type" of social revolution from the socialist revolution, which objectively exists, the advantage of the former.

In speaking of the destructive and creative functions of revolution many petit bourgeois ideologists assert that all previous revolutions exercised only destructive functions. Thus in some cases irrespective of the subjective desires of the petit bourgeois democrats and, in other, entirely deliberately--for anti-Soviet purposes--the fact that the socialist revolution not only destroyed the old system but also laid the foundations of the new one is ignored.

The creative possibilities of the "new type" of revolution are connected with its "moral aspect". Some here champion the ideas of nonviolence (J. Narayan's total revolution concept in India), others (like, for example, the ideologists of "Islamic revolution") recognize the need for violence for the struggle against imperialism, Zionism and the exploiter system, but place their trust in the special leading role of the clergy and jihad. Essentially the interpretation of "Islamic revolution" also shifts the center of gravity to the moral-ethical sphere inasmuch as the social revolution's performance of its creative functions is connected with the assertion of the spiritual values of Islam.

This formulation of the question of revolution ensues from the very nature of the petite bourgeoisie and corresponds to its social ideals and ideas concerning the possibility of the removal of class contradictions in a class society, primarily with the aid of moral-ethical means and traditional institutions, the supraclass nature of national traditions and the feasibility of the limitation and "extermination" even of capitalism under the conditions of defense of the petty-ownership strata which are daily and hourly engendering this capitalism.

The ideas being put forward are a reflection, albeit distorted, of real historical processes. Inasmuch as the class nature of revolution is denied, the petit bourgeois democrats' formulation of the question of the "new type" of revolution is erroneous, but the revolutionary transformations which they propose really represent in some cases elements of consistent bourgeois democratism and, in others, prerequisites for noncapitalist development. Thus in practice we are indeed encountering a new type of revolution which is simultaneously of an anti-imperialist, antifeudal and limited anticapitalist nature, to which the petit bourgeois democrats are attempting to give a meaning. In speaking of the possibility and logical nature of such a revolution for Asian and African countries we should remember V.I. Lenin's words to the effect that "the social revolution is not one battle but an era of a whole number of battles on each and every issue of economic and democratic transformations"* and that the coming social revolution will be an era not only of battles of the proletariat but also of "revolutionary outbursts of part of the petite bourgeoisie with all its prejudices."**

Thus the ideological-political standpoints of the petite bourgeoisie and nonproletarian laboring strata testify, despite all their complexity and contradictoriness and despite all the danger of the reactionary development trends of the petit bourgeois social mentality and political acts, to the expansion of the sphere of action of the revolutionary forces.

*V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Works], vol 27, p 62.

**V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 30, p 54.

The revolutionary-democratic trend of the development of the social thought of the Asian and African peoples is manifested most fully in the ideological-political goals of the ruling parties of countries of a socialist orientation which are taking shape at this time. They reflect the gradual surmounting of the notions of a "third path" of development and the petit bourgeois approach to a solution of the most important economic and political problems.

The differences between the ideological standpoints of revolutionary democracy and the constantly vacillating most populous part of petit bourgeois democracy are manifested primarily in the fact that it is precisely revolutionary democracy which is capable of materializing the anti-imperialist and anticapitalist thrust of the social ideal of petit bourgeois democracy and liquidating the positions of the imperialist monopolies, haute local bourgeoisie and the feudal lords and ensuring state regulation and the preferential development of the cooperative sector. It is precisely the revolutionary-democratic concepts which contain guarantees of the practical implementation of these ideals. This applies primarily to the countries where parties have come to power which are consistently championing the principles of scientific socialism as an integral teaching and where it is they which are engaged in the development of the ideological-political principles of the revolutionary-democratic stage of the revolution.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1981. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatel'stva "Nauka"

8850

CSO: 1807/21

LIMITS ON SHIFTS TO RIGHT IN U.S. DOMESTIC POLICY ANALYZED

Moscow RABOCHIY KASS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 5, Sep-Oct 81 pp 66-75

[Article by Aleksey Aronovich Popov, candidate of historical sciences and senior research assistant of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada: "Washington's Social Policy: Turn Toward Conservatism"]

[Excerpts] Social maneuvering together with a set of measures to regulate the economy constitutes the basis of the entire domestic policy of state-monopoly capitalism in the United States. This is explained by the importance of its mission--maintaining even the relative social stability of the capitalist system in the country.

The buildup of the class struggle in an atmosphere of economic and political crisis serves, as a rule, as the direct cause of the development of social reformism. Such social guarantees as pensions, unemployment compensation and payments for disability, loss of the breadwinner and industrial injury, medical insurance for the elderly, labor laws and the trade unions' heralded right to collective bargaining and to strike are most important gains of the American working class which have been achieved in a long and difficult struggle.

The country's ruling elite and scientific and propagandist literature define the nature of the corresponding legislation as measures to create the "social" or "socially responsible" state (welfare state).¹ This slogan does not, of course, mean any encroachment on the capitalist system and fits within the framework of state-monopoly adaptation to the new, deteriorated conditions of its existence. Simultaneously it reflects the reply which bourgeois-reformist circles give in connection with the demands of the union, negro and other public organizations and the broad working people's masses as a whole.

The social policy of the United States is developing in the following main directions: social security (insurance and assistance), programs in the sphere of health care and housing construction, aid to the cities and areas affected by the depression, regulation of relations between labor and capital and policy in the civil rights sphere.

The foundations of the current social policy were laid in the 1930's, when the rise of the worker and mass democratic movements in response to the 1929-1933 economic catastrophe forced the F. Roosevelt administration and the ruling circles as a

whole to switch to the systematic introduction of methods of state-monopoly regulation in the economic and social spheres. A new surge of reformism followed in the 1960's, when the powerful rise of the worker, negro, student and antiwar movements forced the J. Kennedy and L. Johnson administrations to considerably extend the bounds of state social activity, particularly in the sphere of assistance to the poorest strata of the population and also in the guaranteeing of minimum civil rights for negroes.

The mass movements of the latter half of the 1960's and the first half of the 1970's are explained by the fact that the growth rate of social spending in that period was the highest in U.S. history. Whereas from 1950 through 1965 the proportion of aggregate national (that is, federal government, state and local power authority) social spending in the U.S. GNP increased from 8.8 to 11.7 percent, from 1965 through 1975 it increased to 19.9 percent, including an increase in the proportion of the federal government from 5.7 to 11.5 percent.² However, in the latter half of the 1970's the proportion of social expenditure both in the GNP and in the federal budget ceased to increase and began to decline even with Reagan's assumption of office as a result of a new offensive of the monopolies and rightwing forces. Nevertheless, social programs preserve their significance for vast strata of the population.³

An important singularity of the social programs is their long-term nature and capacity for inertial growth. All the main programs are based on a firm legal foundation and are of unlimited duration (open-end programs). The amounts of the payments at the present time are in the majority of cases tied to the level of inflation. Importance is attached to economic and demographic factors, which are only partially controllable, like the constant growth in the number of retirees, for example, the increase in the numbers of the unemployed and the poor in periods of unfavorable economic conditions and the general rise in the cost of medical services and education, which also leads to an increase in corresponding national spending. In other words, the current state of social policy has been predetermined to a large extent by the legal basis and the decisions which were adopted many years ago and also by current economic-demographic trends.

As a result of this long-term nature of the social programs and the masses' invariable opposition to a reduction in them it took the ruling circles years of purposeful efforts to turn back the trends of the 1960's. The 1970's, when on the basis of the policy of three administrations--of R. Nixon, G. Ford and J. Carter--which operated with the increasing support of the Congress, considerable shifts toward conservatism occurred in the sphere of social policy, were such a period. The assumption of office by the Reagan administration intensified this trend still further. However, it is important to note that the turnabout did not begin with Reagan; it had been prepared to a considerable extent by his predecessors. This circumstance points to the fact that the turn toward conservatism in the sphere of social policy was the general line of the U.S. ruling class in the 1970's and the start of the 1980's, pursued irrespective of which party was in power at a given moment.

The conservatism of the era of developed state-monopoly capitalism is inevitably different from the conservatism of the time of Herbert Hoover. American conservatives have always criticized "excessive" federal intervention in the economy and social relations from fundamental ideological standpoints. This intervention leads, in

the viewpoint of conservative circles, to economic inefficiency, excessive regulation of business, the growth of unproductive expenditure and the swelling of the bureaucratic machinery; it allegedly undermines such traditional American principles as private initiative, individualism and reliance on one's own forces and leads, as a whole, to the "socialization" of the economy and all of society.

However, in practice even the fiercest conservatives, despite all their rhetoric, have been forced to reckon with the realities of the era of state-monopoly capitalism, particularly with the fact that American capitalism today cannot exist without federal regulation of labor relations, the developed system of social security and large-scale investments in the sphere of education and health care.

As a result of the activity of three administrations--those of R. Nixon, G. Ford and J. Carter--and the ruling circles as a whole a distinct turn toward conservatism has been discerned in the development of social policy. This turn has been characterized by the following indications:

as distinct from the 1960's, not a single new major social program was adopted and a whole number of lesser programs was eliminated altogether in the last decade;

the trend toward the liberalization of the programs in effect, that is, toward a broadening of the circle of persons covered by them, the introduction of new benefits and an increase in the amount of the payments has been replaced by a directly opposite trend--a cutting of benefits and a tightening of the eligibility requirements of their recipients;

as a result of these measures the proportion of social spending in the U.S. GNP and in the federal budget stopped rising in 1975, remaining at the level of 20 percent of the GNP and one-half of the federal budget;

social security taxes have risen sharply; and

programs of assistance to the poor have proportionally been cut to the greatest extent.

The Reagan administration and the conservative 97th Congress have continued the offensive against the social programs in the said fields, but in an even sharper form. Table 4 [not shown] gives an idea of the scale of the cuts in appropriations for social needs proposed by the Reagan administration. It compares the social items of the last Carter budget and the first Reagan budget. It has to be taken into account here that the last budget of the Carter administration was drawn up after its defeat in the 1980 election and was for this administration of a maximally conservative nature.

As a whole, the policy of the Reagan administration in the social sphere is proceeding in the same direction as the course of previous administrations, but is distinguished from them in the following parameters:

in the last 25 years the federal government's social spending as a whole rose at a rate three times that of the GNP growth rate, but had slowed abruptly by the end of this period. By the end of the 1970's the Carter administration had managed to

lower the rate of growth of this spending to a level comparable to the GNP growth rate. The Reagan administration—for the first time since the war--plans to reduce the proportion of social spending in the country's GNP. As before, expenditure on social needs will constitute one-half of the federal budget, but the proportion of the budget itself in the GNP will decline, according to the administration's plans, from 23 percent in 1981 to 19 percent in 1986;

also for the first time in recent decades an absolute reduction--and a sharp one, moreover--is envisaged in appropriations for assistance to the poor and for social services. The Republican administration has literally attacked these items of the budget. It is planned to practically do away with the main public jobs and job-training programs, to reduce threefold the federal government's obligations with respect to subsidized housing programs and to abolish or transfer to the jurisdiction of the states many programs in the sphere of education, health care and aid to the cities. There will be very significant cuts in the food stamp, school lunch, Medicaid and aid to families with dependent children [AFDC] programs and others. All this will have a grave effect on the situation of millions of people in the United States;

the Reagan administration and conservative circles as a whole have drawn up a program of anti-union, anti-negro and other measures directed against the interests of the democratic forces. They include an easing of work-safety measures, repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act, that is, in effect, a reduction in the wages of construction workers working on federal contracts, an end to school busing for racial integration, abolition of a number of environmental protection organizations and so forth; and

the ideological offensive and the indoctrination of public opinion is proceeding under other, more emphatic slogans. Whereas the Carter administration paid lipservice to support for certain liberal reforms in the social sphere and referred merely to a shortage of funds to implement them, the Reagan administration supports in principle limitation of federal intervention in the socioeconomic sphere and the granting of the maximum freedom to the monopolies.

Thus the conservative trends in the development of the United States' national social policy, which had been strengthening continuously in the last decade, have been embodied to the maximum extent in the policy of the Reagan administration.

What are the reasons for the turn to a conservative course in the social sphere? These reasons are connected primarily with the changes in the United States' economic and foreign policy situation. A period of relatively rapid economic growth and "prosperity" connected with this came to an end in the last decade. The United States entered a period of protracted economic slumps, the unforeseen and far-reaching energy crisis and increasing rises in inflation with a simultaneous increase in unemployment. All this was accompanied by constant large budget deficits, negative balances of trade and payments, a drop in the dollar's exchange rate, increased foreign competition, a deceleration of the labor productivity growth rate and increased dependence on foreign sources of oil. All this served as the stimulus to the pursuit of a tough socioeconomic policy within the country.

The situation was exacerbated even further by the United States' foreign policy defeats in various regions of the world. Endeavoring to restore to the United States

the positions of past supremacy in military might, both the Nixon and Ford Republican administrations and the J. Carter Democratic administration consistently exerted efforts to change the trend which had been discerned since 1968 toward a relative decline in the proportion of military spending in the U.S. GNP and in the federal budget. This had mainly been achieved by the mid-1970's. In the latter half of the 1970's a long-term program was adopted of an increase in defense spending of no less than 3 percent annually in real terms. But the military program proposed by President Reagan provides for an unprecedented range of the arms race: in 5 years it is planned to spend \$1.5 trillion, and expenditure will increase 15 percent in 1982. Social programs have been the first victim of this approach.

Thus the fact that room for social maneuvering has been restricted is explained primarily by the imperialist system of priorities to which the ruling circles have adhered in the 1970's and at the start of the 1980's. It is from this that the endeavor to economize on social programs, which has become predominant in the establishment's domestic policy, has ensued.

In speaking of the reasons for the turnabout it should be considered that there occurred in the said period not only shifts in the thinking of the ruling circles but also broader changes in the mass consciousness of Americans.

The American working people and the U.S. working class had every reason to be dissatisfied with their situation. As a result of the new offensive of the monopolies the working people's real wages began to decline in 1973 and went down particularly sharply, moreover, in 1979-1980. Whereas from 1972 through 1978 the average wage declined 3.2 percent, it declined 10 percent in 1979-1980 alone. This represented a sharp contrast with the situation to which ordinary Americans had been accustomed in the first 25 years since the war, when there was a constant growth of real wages. Many workers have been forced to seriously revise their plans and abandon their cherished dream of acquiring their own home by installments or sending their children to college.

The approximately 8-9 million working people who (as of 1980) are covered by collective contracts providing for a "sliding wage scale"¹⁸ have been affected least by the decline in wages. But even the strongest unions like the auto workers, for example, have been unable to protect their members from mass unemployment. This situation has given rise to the active, although not always realized protest of the working people. "In the 1970's," the well-known union expert Gus Tyler wrote, "the worker easily flies into a rage.... Our worker is ready for battle. But he does not properly know on whom to declare war."¹⁹

The ruling circles, particularly the conservative groupings, attempted to latch on to and use in their own interests the working people's legitimate discontent. The mass information media instilled in the working people and ordinary Americans the fact that so-called "big government" was to blame for everything. In reality the activity of "big government," that is, federal intervention in the economy and social relations was brought about by no means by a "fallacious endeavor by liberals and groups accustomed to living at the government's expense" and to squander the taxpayers' money but by the state-monopoly nature of American capitalism, which even conservative circles are incapable of changing, despite all their rhetoric. Nevertheless, as public opinion polls showed, the majority of Americans came to consider the budget deficit the principal cause of inflation, which has become America's

No 1 problem, and propaganda tried to have them believe that it could be overcome only by cutting appropriations for assistance to the unemployed, the poor and the elderly.²⁰

The attack on the poorest strata of the population became widespread in the said period. The mass information media portrayed the poor as "loafers" who do not want to work and wish to live off honest workers. The workers were persuaded that they were paying for swollen programs of support for "loafers". In veiled form this propaganda preached racism inasmuch as the typical image of the poor person was presented to ordinary Americans by the efforts of the mass information media in the form of the inhabitants of negro or Puerto Rican ghettos.

Conservative propaganda's method of "lumping all problems together" in the following device was particularly successful: "big government" is squandering the taxpayers' money on supporting "loafers," unconcerned to preserve a balanced budget, the result of which is increasing taxes and inflation undermining the living standard of the majority of working Americans. In order "to get the American system working again" it is necessary to reduce taxes and, correspondingly, the federal budget, free business from excessive regulation on the part of government and freeze social programs. Such, according to a union newspaper, "are the simplistic solutions which the Republican Party strategists have proposed for the anxious and troubled American working people"²¹ at the 1980 elections.

As much American material also indicates, the true state of affairs concerning social programs did not correspond to this reactionary propaganda. Social policy in the United States is of a class nature, whence its negative aspects for the working people--the high level of taxation, for example--but these minuses lead by no means to the conclusions drawn by conservative circles. It is by no means necessary to cut back social programs to reduce taxes. Ultimately the workers, farmers, minorities, the old and other groups of the population are interested not only in the preservation but also the further development and the democratization of social legislation.

The assertion that social policy is virtually the main cause of inflation had to be repudiated in the course of the 1980 election campaign by conservative political figures even, who acknowledged that the federal budget deficit is responsible for only a small part of the increase in inflation (of the order of 0.2 percent). Expenditure on the programs which are the main target for attack (school busing, hiring quotas, AFDC) constituted less than 3 percent of total expenditure on social needs and could by no means have been the cause of increased taxes. Even the total abandonment of these "unpopular programs" would not have brought about any pronounced alleviation of the tax burden for ordinary Americans.

Nor does the false proposition that the social appropriations go mainly to feed "loafers" and even contribute to the growth of the Lumpenproletariat, by which is meant mainly the unemployed inhabitants of the ghettos, withstand criticism upon comparison with the facts.

According to data of the Congressional Research Service, direct cash payments to the population in accordance with the social security and assistance programs in 1976 were distributed thus:

only one-third of all cash payments goes to the poorest 20 percent of the population, and 53.8 percent to the 60 percent of the population which American bourgeois science puts in the category of the "middle class," which is allegedly unhappy with social policy in principle. However, ghetto inhabitants are by no means the majority even of these poorest 20 percent. The growth of social spending is connected with the physical and social need of far broader strata of the population.

The social security system is more effective in helping white families escape poverty than black families. Thus thanks to payments in accordance with this system in 1976, the number of white families living in poverty had declined by a factor of 2.4--from 16.3 million (23.3 percent of white families) to 6.7 million families (9.7 percent)²² and of black families by a factor of only 1.7--from 3.9 million (41.8 percent of black families) to 2.3 million (24.7 percent).²³

Of course, a certain redistribution of income in favor of the poorest strata is occurring as a result of the operation of the social security system, but on a very modest scale. Throughout the postwar period inequality in income distribution in the United States has practically remained unchanged. In 1947 the least well-to-do 20 percent of the population obtained 5.1 percent of personal income, while the most well-to-do 20 percent of the population obtained 43.3 percent; these indicators were almost the same in 1978: 5.2 percent and 41.5 percent.²⁴ In recent decades the inequality in private income distribution has grown even, but there has been a simultaneous growth--as a counterbalancing trend--in the volume of federal transfer payments to the population, and it is these payments, made within the framework of federal social policy, which have maintained unequal income distribution at the level of the immediate postwar years. Specialists from the Brookings Institution, inter alia, arrived at this conclusion, observing that "in the last two decades...private income distribution has tended toward even greater inequality, but in the same period growing federal transfer payments roughly balanced the effect of the inequality."²⁵

Undoubtedly, being primarily the result of the demands and struggle of the people's masses and the gain of the working class, social payments and services are of importance to broad strata of Americans, in many cases helping them escape physical poverty and providing them with at least a modest living standard. Thus if we take into account income excluding social payments obtained from private sources (wages, dividends, private pensions and so forth), it transpires that in 1965 in the United States 21.3 percent of the population or 41.4 million persons had an income below the "poverty level," while in 1976 such people constituted 21 percent of the population or 45.2 million. With the addition, however, of payments in accordance with the social security system, this number declines to 15.6 percent or 30.3 million persons in 1965 and 11.8 percent or 25.4 million persons in 1976.²⁶

Objective data confirm the majority of Americans' concern for the social guarantees granted by the nation. That is why as a whole, despite all the noise kicked up by the mass information media concerning some unpopular programs, the majority of Americans firmly supported the nation's social activity and not only has not demanded that it be wound up but in many instances has advocated an increase in the volume of social services.

For this very reason opposition to the policy of the Reagan administration will probably grow as the working people begin to realize in practice all of its negative consequences. The main force opposing the offensive of the reactionary circles is, as before, the working class, which is marching in the vanguard of the antimonopoly struggle.

FOOTNOTES

1. The term "welfare state" is often translated in Soviet literature as "state of universal prosperity". This translation is not, however, entirely accurate. The words "public welfare," taken from official statistics, mean not "social prosperity" but the "social activity of the state" (in a narrower sense "welfare" means assistance programs to the poorest part of the population). Similarly the term "welfare state" is employed to designate a state with developed social legislation. Thus the translation "social state" seems more accurate.
2. Statistical Abstract of the United States 1976, Washington, 1976, p 293.
3. In 1979 payments in accordance only with the general social security program (pensions, disability benefits, payments for loss of the breadwinner) were received by over 35 million persons, in accordance with other security programs (unemployment, industrial accident and others) by a further 11 million persons, direct cash benefits to the needy by over 15 million persons and food aid by over 20 million persons; in addition, approximately 25 million persons availed themselves of medical assistance programs. See SOCIAL SECURITY BULLETIN No 7, 1980. The Budget of the U.S. Government. Fiscal Year 1981, Washington, 1980; Statistical Abstract of the United States 1979, Washington, 1979.
18. AFL-CIO AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST No 8, 1980, p 12.
19. J.A. Ryan (ed.) "White Ethnic Life in Working Class America," Englewood Cliffs, 1973, pp 130-131.
20. AFL-CIO AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST No 5, 1980, p 8.
21. AFL-CIO NEWS 9 August 1980, p 3.
22. Including families consisting of 1 person.
23. "Poverty Status of the Population...", p 13.
24. AFL-CIO AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST NO 5, 1980, pp 14-15.
25. "Setting National Priorities. The Next Ten Years," pp 527-528.
26. NATIONAL JOURNAL 3 March 1979, p 342.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1981

8850

CSO: 1807/22

U.S.-SOVIET SYMPOSIUM ON CRISIS OF CAPITALISM, WORKING CLASS

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 5, Sep-Oct 81 pp 165-170

[A.B. report on Soviet-American symposium: "The Working Class Under Crisis Conditions"]

[Text] The second Soviet-American symposium devoted to discussion of the theme "The Capitalist Crisis, Transnational Corporations and the Working Class" and also a number of other questions connected with the situation and struggle of the working people was held at the end of June this year in Moscow.

Prof [I]. Wallerstein ([Fernan Brodel'] Center), Prof D. Arrigi (New York State University), Prof L. Stichter (Massachusetts State University), Prof [S]. Shaffer (Tufts University, Medford), Prof M. Selden ([Fernan Brodel'] Center), Prof M. Dubofsky ([Fernan Brodel'] Center) and Prof [I]. Higginson (New York State University) came from the United States to take part.

The Soviet side was represented at the symposium by scholars from the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement and from the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov.

The session was opened by T.T. Timofeyev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He noted the importance of these contacts between USSR and U.S. social scientists, which are starting to become traditional, and the usefulness of a high-minded and businesslike exchange of opinions between representatives of different schools and currents. Having analyzed in detail many aspects of crisis phenomena in bourgeois social science, T.T. Timofeyev also dwelt specially on certain topical problems of the working class' struggle for its interests under the conditions of the growing expansion of the transnational corporations in the capitalist world.

The speech of Prof [I]. Wallerstein, who touched on a number of aspects of the history of capitalist crises, was received with interest. The largely debatable nature of the approaches, evaluations and conclusions contained in the American scholar's speech were brought to light here.

But the biggest clash of opinions was caused by the paper of Prof D. Arrigi, in which he attempted to reveal the criteria of a periodization of the history of the workers' movement and to determine the most important stages in its development. In his

opinion, the history of mutual relations between labor and capital in the last 100 years fits sufficiently precisely into the general regularities of the economic development of the technically advanced capitalist countries. Three main stages can be highlighted in the growth of the working class and in its transition from weakness to strength. These stages, in Arrigi's outline, are connected with the three major depressions which have embraced the economy of world capitalism.

The first, in the final quarter of the last century, was characterized by the weakness of the workers' organizations in defense of the interests of the working people. In this period the functioning of the market mechanism contributed to rapid economic growth and the fundamental reorganization of capitalism's industrial apparatus.

The second covers the period from the end of WWI through the 1929-1933 crisis. Throughout this time the entire potential of the workers' movement was used for the struggle for a rise in the working people's living standard. As before, the bourgeoisie used unemployment as a means of pressure on the working class, although the level thereof needed to be higher for this pressure to prove more effective. At this time the market mechanism performed a negative role for the working people.

In the second half of our century, under conditions wherein the third depression has begun to mature, a fundamentally new situation has taken shape. The workers' movement has increased to a tremendous extent its possibilities of struggle for an improvement in the workers' living and work conditions and against the ruinous effect of the forces of the market mechanism. The working people have managed to achieve significant results in their struggle. The strike movement has been raised to a qualitatively higher level. And even the exceptional spread of unemployment has been unable to restrain the working class' protests against exploitation. True, it has still performed to a certain extent the definite role of "disciplining" factor for the working people. The causes of the exacerbation of the employment problem here are concealed, as the speaker said, primarily in the changed demographic situation in the world and the appearance in the labor market of large detachments of young people whose chances of finding a job are constantly declining.

This period is characterized by the further development and strengthening of such a phenomenon as the recalcitrance of the working class in respect of the bourgeoisie and its "uncontrollability". It is precisely in the strengthening of the working people's strike struggle and the increasingly resolute attempts to intrude upon the power prerogatives of the entrepreneurs that these changes in the working class are being most graphically manifested.

Doctor of Historical Sciences A.A. Galkin (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement), who spoke next, observed that many of the problems which earlier might have seemed academic are now becoming the center of the ideological-theoretical struggle in the workers' movement. The books on the workers' movement which have appeared recently have raised particularly sharply the question of the evaluation of the present stage of the crisis of capitalism. It is important to determine what new features it has entailed. We have our own viewpoint in this connection (it was reflected, for example, in the monograph "Obostreniye obshchego krizisa kapitalizma i rabochiy klass v Zapadnoy Yevrope" [Exacerbation of the General Crisis of Capitalism and the Working Class in Western Europe], Moscow, "Nauka," 1981).

Inherent in Prof D. Arrigi's methodological approach, A.A. Galkin said, is an endeavor to see the unfolding of present-day events as a link in the chain of the age-old history of the development of the working class. But there are certain dangers here. For example, if we take endless statistical series, rises and falls in the development of the workers' movement can be seen. In this respect such fluctuations were outlined correctly at times by the previous speaker. But the real difficulties arrive only after the fact of the existence of such fluctuations has been ascertained. We are faced squarely here by the question of the interpretation of all the noted changes. In other words, to what extent can they be linked with the crises and upturns in the economy. Nor can we at the same time fail to take account of the certain autonomy of superstructural processes and also a kind of "overlapping" of the consecutive stages.

In the first half of the 1970's the crisis phenomena in the economy of the capitalist countries acquired new features and introduced pronounced changes to the conditions of the working class' struggle.

In particular, it is quite insufficient to say that the economic mechanism of the world capitalist system is embraced by profound crisis. We believe that a combination and interweaving of two processes--a cyclical crisis and a structural crisis--are under way. At the basis of the intensification of the current crisis processes in the economy of capitalism is, first, the narrowing of the sphere of capital's functioning brought about by the correlation of world forces, which is exacerbating the objectively caused shortage of usable raw material and energy resources and limiting the capacity of the markets, second, the influence of the current stage of the scientific-technical revolution, which is characterized by the intensive introduction of new equipment and technology directly in production and, third, by irregularities in the work of the machinery of state-monopoly regulation.

It is also important to determine why the feverish introduction of new labor-saving technology began precisely in the 1970's. Generally speaking, three basic elements of contemporary production may be highlighted: raw material and energy resources; embodied labor; and live labor. Whereas the period through the mid-1970's was characterized by the cheapness of raw material and energy, which afforded capital a certain freedom of maneuver in the question of the remuneration of live labor and enabled it to compensate for its increased costs to a certain extent, subsequently this reserve has shown itself to be mostly exhausted. As a result an additional incentive emerged not only for economies in power engineering and raw materials but also for savings of live labor in cost form. And since political conditions have prevented a lowering of wages the bourgeoisie has been forced to resort to a reduction in the strength of the work force employed at each enterprise.

A.A. Galkin expressed disagreement with D. Arrigi's opinion concerning the decisive role of demographic factors in the process of increased unemployment. As a counter-argument he adduced data testifying to the fact that in recent years there had been a considerable growth in the manufacture of output with the same number of employed workers as in the lowest phases of the economic cycle in the past. That is, the bourgeoisie has found a way out of the situation in the extensive application of labor-saving equipment. This applies particularly to the sectors of nonmaterial production. But in recent times it is this which served as a kind of reservoir absorbing surplus manpower. Now, however, this reservoir has itself become the supplier of the ranks of the army of unemployed.

Thus under present conditions it is far more difficult for the working class to resist the offensive of capital. Yet, nonetheless, the growing organization of the working class and its application to an increasingly great extent in its struggle of political means are constantly making themselves felt. It has to be acknowledged that the working class as a whole has managed to prevent a sharp decline in the living standard and a reduction in wages. However, there are doubts as to whether this is a regularity of the period which D. Arrigi termed the third depression. Unfortunately, a lowering of real wages is nevertheless occurring in certain countries, and if decisive measures are not adopted, this process could continue.

D. Arrigi was perfectly correct, A.A. Gaikin continued, to point out that in the 1970's the ruling classes rarely resorted to political forms of suppression of the workers' movement. But can the working class be considered to be guaranteed against the use of such methods on the part of the bourgeoisie? Such guarantees, I dare say, do not exist. Much will also depend here on the intensity of the class struggle and the strength of the working people's resistance.

For the proletariat the current stage of the general crisis of capitalism is one of persistent struggle under conditions which are not always favorable to the working class. For this reason the working people and their organizations are confronted by complex new tasks.

An interesting, meaningful paper at the symposium was delivered by Doctor of Historical Sciences N.V. Sivachev (head of the Department of Recent and Most Recent History at the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov). He made a detailed analysis of the practice of state-monopoly regulation of labor relations on the basis of the example of the biggest country of the capitalist world--the United States. Development of the institutions of this regulation has become bipartisan policy pursued by both Democrats and Republicans. Neoliberalism and neoconservatism noticeably joined together on this question in the past decade: neoliberal Democrats moved in their social policy to the right, while neoconservative Republicans, while remaining in their former antiworker positions, applied statist measures more boldly, particularly in the period of government of the R. Nixon administration. As a result a very heavy burden of every conceivable federal order holding back both their struggle for their socioeconomic demands and the growth of the ideological independence of the working class has been lumped on the shoulders of the American workers. As an example N.V. Sivachev cited the fact that in the mid-1970's the Department of Labor was monitoring the fulfillment of over 150 laws affecting all aspects of the life of American workers.

The crisis of the state-monopoly methods of regulating the U.S. economy has come to be manifested more sharply since the end of the 1960's. Whereas the start of the 1930's was marked by upheavals of the foundations of unregulated capitalism, now, the speaker observed, we are witnessing how statism, with its idea of the active state, is proving an ineffective means of overcoming the curses of monopoly capitalism. A consequence of this has been on the one hand democratic antistatism, which has been expressed in a mass of protest movements of every conceivable kind against the existing order, the center of which has been the idea of the expansion of the role of the state which has been imposed since "New Deal" times, and, on the other, increased neoconservatism in its more reactionary variant than the D. Eisenhower-R. Nixon-G. Ford "new Republicanism".

The neoliberalism of the Democrats, profoundly undermined and weakened, has manifestly exhausted its reformatory potential at the current stage. This was one of the most important reasons for the defeat of F. Roosevelt's party at the 1980 elections. The Republicans won not only the White House but also a majority in one of the chambers of the Congress (the Senate) following the Democrats' 26 years of uninterrupted predominance in the highest legislative body.

R. Reagan's Republican neoconservatism has incorporated in its value system a considerable proportion of reactionary individualism. The Republican Party came to power on an anti-union, antiworker platform which proclaimed federal support for the reactionary right-to-work laws and demanded a lowering of the minimum wage for young workers and a reduction in social payments to the working people.

The present official increased accent on individualism, N.V. Sivachev emphasized in conclusion, and also the criticism of statism have a perfectly definite social, class coloration. It is not a question of the intention and possibility of dismantling the state-monopoly foundations and mechanisms which have evolved since "New Deal" times. The irreversibility of the practice of state-monopoly capitalism has very quickly revealed the limits of Reagan's antistatist rhetoric, which more than anything is merely replenishing the collection of the social folklore of individualism. A real change in the form of state-monopoly capitalism is occurring in practice, which is assuming more reactionary contours. This is manifested in both economic and social policy. Working policy has moved markedly to the right, which has put the U.S. working class in an even more difficult position and made the task of stimulation of the antimonopoly struggle even more urgent.

Returning to Prof D. Arrigi's speech, Doctor of Historical Sciences B.I. Koval', deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement, observed that the problems of periodization of the workers' movement are essentially very complicated. The history of the workers' movement has its own logic, which does not concur with the logic of the development of capitalism, which reflects merely a change in the conditions in which the struggle of the working class takes place. Therefore the separation of three depressions could in itself hardly arouse objections. But the rigid linkage of different stages of the worker's development to these depressions does not appear entirely convincing. Thus whereas the first of the depressions mentioned by the American expert is related to the stage of free-competition capitalism, the two others are related to the period of monopoly capitalism, that is, imperialism.

Further, it is hardly possible to agree with the speaker's probably involuntary aspiration to a globalization of the outlines he has constructed. The point being that the development of the working class and, accordingly, the change in the forms and methods of its struggle and its fruitfulness have occurred dissimilarly in countries at different stages of the development of capitalist relations. That is, in other words, a more complex, "mosaic" picture emerges upon more detailed examination.

In his speech Doctor of Historical Sciences S.A. Yershov (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement) developed the idea that in determining the periodization of the history of the working class it is necessary to take account of the degree of development of the production forces. An analysis shows that three such stages exist. First, simple machine production, second, conveyORIZED

production and, third, automated production. Although the periodization put forward by Prof D. Arrigi proceeds from entirely different principles, the stages which he highlights coincide, as a whole, with the stages of the development of the production forces. It is most likely that the transition from one stage to another, which is clearly visible to economists, is also perceived in some way by historians.

In the main part of his paper S.A. Yershov examined the economic and social aspects of the present crisis in the industry of the capitalist countries on the basis of the example of the auto industry. He showed that the sectorial crisis in the auto industry is a reflection of the process of a profound technological reorganization of capitalist production which has begun and which is occurring in the form of the fusion of the line production method with automation. One of the first to introduce the new technology were the transnational corporations for it is they which, commissioning new enterprises overseas, are encountering the problem of increasing manpower costs, which is prompting them to implement production efficiency measures.

All these facts are creating complex conditions for the union's development of starting positions in the formulation of a platform of demands of the transnational corporations. It is most often a question here of the nature of the use of the new capital investments of the overseas monopolies and, in particular, of the choice between extensive and intensive factors of the development of production in every instance. Thus it is possible to speak of a new stage of the confrontation of labor and capital, which, as factors show, is being exacerbated at the bourgeois state level also.

The problems of the workers' movement under current conditions, which are characterized by an unprecedented increase in the domination of the transnational corporations and a broadening of the direct and indirect intervention of the bourgeois state in the problems of technical and technological policy, determination of the economic and currency-finance norms of the functioning of the economic mechanism and the regulation of many aspects of the organization of production within the framework of individual countries, were discussed in his speech by Doctor of Historical Sciences V.G. Gel'bras (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement). The transnational corporations' relations with states and their dependence on their own government and the governments of other countries where this corporation or the other conducts its activity are so considerable and multifaceted, he emphasized, that for two decades the unions of the developed capitalist countries have been forced to take account of this fact increasingly comprehensively in their activity.

Nor can the unions fail to reckon with the fact that the activity of both the transnational corporations and the states supporting the expansion of the corporations or limiting it has assumed an international nature. And this means that the significance of political problems and the demands in the union's strategic and tactical platforms will increase.

Even now in many instances the solution of economic and social problems, primarily those of ensuring full employment and curbing inflation, which simultaneously affect the interests of the overwhelming mass of working people, is impossible outside of the framework of serious long-term programs. Even now it is sometimes inconceivable to find the optimum solution of the urgent professional demands of individual groups of working people by examining them outside of the framework of the overall socio-economic context of the life of a given society and outside of its economic and other

relations with other countries. Thus the struggle for a democratic alternative and for the unions' equal participation in the solution of the political problems of the life both of individual countries and the entire international community will spread and intensify.

A number of problems of the American trade union movement, which is developing under the conditions of the intensification of the crisis of capitalist society, were raised in his speech by Candidate of Historical Sciences Yu.N. Rogulev (Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov). He observed that although the American unions mainly adhere to positions of "practical unionism," support the private enterprise system and demonstrate their loyalty with respect to the state and the political system of capitalism as a whole, this does not change the hostile attitude toward them on the part of business, the state's administrative regulatory authorities and legislative and judicial authority.

U.S. labor laws are currently not in a position to protect the unions from the arbitrariness of the monopolies. All the attempts of the workers' organizations here to achieve reforms in these laws, employing propaganda campaigns and lobbying tactics in Congress, have failed. And the likelihood of success in this matter in the immediate future appears more than problematical.

The unions' activity recently has been impeded by such negative factors as internal division and the struggle of different currents. The unions have proven susceptible to bureaucratization and corruption, which have severely undermined the authority and possibilities of these organizations. The conservative, narrow-economic views of the union leaders have prevented the formulation of new forms and methods of struggle and the formulation of new tasks.

At the same time a number of objective causes of the difficulties of the American union movement may be highlighted. As a result of the state's intervention in labor relations the unions have largely lost their positions in the economic struggle. The unions have also encountered such processes as the change in the social structure of American society, automation and other consequences of the scientific-technical revolution with which they have been unable to cope successfully. Meanwhile these processes have seriously undermined the possibilities for an increase in the numbers of the workers' organizations. A negative socioeconomic background has also been created by the spread of mass unemployment and the galvanization of the activity of the transnational corporations and the relocation of a number of sectors of industry in the South and West of the country.

Having made a critical examination of the antiworker concepts which have appeared recently in bourgeois literature, Yu.N. Rogulev adduced arguments proving their groundlessness. First, as the experience of the current crisis shows, only the working people themselves with the help of the professional organizations can defend and champion their interests. No other force--not the state, the bourgeois parties nor, even less, business--will assume this role. The sooner the working people recognize the need for the strengthening of the unions, the sooner and more successfully they will be able to solve their problems. Second, the role and significance of the unions objectively increase under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism and the extensive use of "bourgeois-collectivist" methods of the solution of socioeconomic problems. The state's intervention has raised the working people's struggle

from the local to the national level. The individual worker is currently powerless in the face of the joint might of the state and business. Only united unions are capable of really defending the working people's interests. It is not fortuitous that an increasingly large part of their demands is addressed directly to the state.

The unions, the speaker observed in conclusion of his speech, possess great potential in the political struggle. However, their weakness in the United States is that they put their hopes mainly in cooperation with the Democratic Party. As a result the unions' demands, which are "adapted" accordingly, lose their original import. Because of this, in particular, the union rank and file often ignore the leadership's position at elections, do not vote or vote by no means as their leaders would wish. For this reason it is perfectly natural that under the current conditions of economic crisis and the deterioration of the political climate in the country the American unions are undergoing a process of growth of the realization of the need to step up their economic and political activity and formulate and consistently implement a self-sufficient and independent policy.

The paper of Candidate of Historical Sciences I.M. Savel'yeva (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement), which was based on an analysis of the data of concrete sociological research conducted recently in the United States, was devoted to the changes in the consciousness of the working class under the conditions of the present crisis phenomena. Among the workers, she observed, there has been an increased sense of uncertainty about the future and an increased perception of the instability of the situation taking shape. There has been a break with the stereotypes which evolved following WWII, in accordance with which America occupies an "exclusive" position in the world in all respects, including the working people's living standard.

There has been a pronounced growth of mistrust in national policy, a realization of the inefficiency of the functioning of the leading economic and political institutions of the state and a sharp decline in the popularity of the main social programs. Although discontent with government versions of a solution of socioeconomic problems is characteristic here of the American social consciousness as a whole, these changes are expressed far more boldly among the working class.

In his paper Candidate of Historical Sciences Yu.V. Yemel'yanov (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement) examined problems of the impact of the current crisis on the youth. He drew attention, in particular, to the seemingly paradoxical combination of the political passiveness and social "escapism" among the youth and the fascination with extreme left and right forms of political ideology. At the same time we can observe together with a growth of extreme reactions to the exacerbation of socioeconomic problems the growth of the activeness of organizations of the working people and the student youth advocating the implementation of fundamental social transformations. Ultimately it is the social forces which put forward a realistic program of a solution of the problems of the younger generation, which have been exacerbated as the result of the development of the crisis phenomena and the capitalist use of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution, which will be able to count on its effective support.

The speech of Candidate of Historical Sciences M.I. Lapitskiy (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement), who paid special attention to studies in the sphere of America's workers' movement, was a kind of survey of the achievements of Soviet American studies.

Other problems were also examined at the symposium. Prof [S]. Shaffer devoted her speech to certain questions of the history of the workers' movement in China. She put forward her conception of a periodization of the workers' movement, according to which a manifest turning point in the development of the Chinese workers' movement was 1927, prior to which it had been on the rise. But following the Kuomintang leadership's rout of the trade unions headed by the communists, progressive development was replaced by a reverse trend. [S]. Shaffer then illustrated certain features of the history of the Chinese workers' movement at the start of the 1930's.

The study of Chinese problems was continued by V.G. Gel'bras. An in-depth study of Chinese history, he observed, is enabling us to interpret better the current processes occurring in Chinese society. The central problems confronting the Chinese working people currently are those of starvation and unemployment. In accordance with publications which have appeared in recent years, it is the accepted belief that approximately 100 million people in the country are starving or are on the verge of starvation. But if we take more precise data on the amount of the income of the peasants and industrial workers and employees, the picture proves more pessimistic. It can be claimed with a high degree of reliability that not 100 million but, as a minimum, from 300 to 400 million Chinese are forced to drag out a starvation or semistarvation existence.

Matters are just the same concerning the size of unemployment. The world press usually cites reports to the effect that approximately 20 million persons are without work in China. This figure most probably reflects the scale of unemployment in the cities, it is true. But there are also data to the effect that 20-30 percent of the peasants in the countryside do not receive production assignments, that is, are essentially excluded from the production process. With regard for this fact, the size of unemployment will be several times higher.

Prof M. Selden examined in his speech some of the problems of the Chinese workers' movement in the 1930's and 1940's. He paid particular attention to the connection of the workers' movement with the movement of resistance to Japanese aggression.

An analysis of certain aspects of the development of the American workers' movement was contained in the paper of Prof M. Dubofsky. A dual manpower market exists in the United States, the speaker observed, in the opinion of many American economists. One enlists in the technically developed production sectors highly skilled workers represented, in the main, by white males of European extraction. The second enlists workers with minimal skills among whom the nonwhite population and women are predominant. The level of the union activeness of these categories of workers is minimal.

Mention should also be made of the existence of the problem of the new worker strata whose appearance has been brought about by the development of the scientific-technical revolution. They are enlisted in the union movement with great difficulty, as a rule.

In the United States the present crisis is viewed as a result of the damage of the methods of liberal federal regulation of the capitalist economy. All this is forcing ways out of the crisis to be sought on the paths of conservatism. But conservative methods also are hardly capable of leading to the desired results. The supposition

may be expressed, M. Dubofsky said in conclusion, that the failure of the R. Reagan administration's attempts to solve many complex problems by way of an intensification of conservative trends could lead to a turn to the left in the American worker and trade union movement.

A number of speeches touched on questions connected with the situation and struggle of the proletariat in various African countries. The formation of a working class in the states of Tropical Africa was the center of the attention of Prof L. Stichter's paper. And, moreover, these processes were studied in the most detail with reference to Zambia, Zaire and Zimbabwe. Prof [I]. Higginson described to the participants in the symposium the results of a study of the structure of the working class of Southern Africa and the forms and methods of its struggle.

Closing the sessions of the symposium, T.T. Timofeyev pointed out that although the exchange of opinions had revealed a divergence of viewpoints on a number of the questions under discussion, it was precisely the confrontation of different standpoints which made the present symposium interesting and meaningful.

At the same time, as the symposium showed, the potential for mutual contacts between Soviet and American scholars are far from exhausted. There is a multitude of problems into which research is being conducted in both countries, and a comparison of its results and familiarization therewith is of mutual interest. It is important here to pay considerable attention to questions of the interconnection of the struggle of the masses against the threat of war and for peace and social progress and the problems of the development of the international solidarity of the working people, in their struggle against the negative consequences of the activity of the transnational corporations included.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1981

8850

CSO: 1807/22

U. S., PRC ATTEMPTS TO UNDERMINE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT CONDEMNED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 81 pp 7-10

[Article by Vladimir Kotlyarov, Cand. Sc. (History)]

[Text] **T**he nonaligned movement came into being as a result of a successful struggle by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for their emancipation, and as a result of a further consolidation of world socialism. The creation of this movement was an expression of protest by the former colonies and semi-colonies against the attempts of imperialist powers to keep them under control and preserve them as a source of raw materials for the developed capitalist states' economies. The documents issued by the nonaligned movement stress that the member countries oppose imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism and favour non-participation in military-political blocs and the consolidation of peace and international security.

The Bandung Conference (April 1955) at which the heads of state and government of 29 African and Asian countries met for the first time, served as a point of departure for the emergence of the nonaligned movement. The participation in the conference of members of different blocs (Turkey, Iraq, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand), and also of Japan and South Vietnam limited its anti-imperialist drive. However, on the initiative of the majority of its participants, the Conference approved the principles which formed the foundation of the activities of the movement.

The First Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries in Belgrade (September 1961) was the organisational start of the movement. The declaration adopted at this Conference stressed that the principles of peaceful coexistence were the "only alternative to cold war and a possible total nuclear catastrophe". The final document of the Second Conference of the Nonaligned Countries (Cairo, 1964) stated that joint action of the non-aligned countries and other peace-

ving, anti-imperialist and progressive forces would be indispensable for achieving the tasks of the movement.

This idea of a need for joint actions became especially important in the latter half of the 1960s which proved to be a difficult period for the movement. As a result of the imperialist policy of interference in the internal affairs of other states, of military putsches, and various intrigues, the situation in the area of national liberation struggles was sharply aggravated. India found herself involved in an armed conflict provoked by

Pakistan, which exacerbated the situation in South Asia. Egypt, Syria, and Jordan became victims of the Israeli aggression. As a result, the situation in the Middle East became even more complicated. Imperialist aggression in Indochina undermined the foundations of peace and security in Southeast Asia. The developments in Indonesia in 1965 and the removal of the Sukarno government from power definitely weakened that country's positions within the nonaligned movement and resulted in a general deterioration of the political climate throughout the region. As President Tito of Yugoslavia, one of the founders of the nonaligned movement, pointed out, imperialism was attempting to eliminate or dissociate the forces and regimes which were striving for progressive development. "This policy of aggressive pressures," he wrote, "initially met with certain success. The nonaligned countries, especially in Africa and, to a certain extent, in Asia, were in confusion, kept aloof, concentrated their attention on their domestic problems and maintained that in this way, they would be able to counter the pressure brought to bear by imperialist forces."

The 1970s were marked by increased anti-imperialist activities on the part of the nonaligned movement. This trend

was mirrored in the documents of the Third Conference (Lusaka, 1970) which contained a resolute appeal for the nonaligned states' solidarity with the countries which were victims of the aggressive wars unleashed by imperialism in the Middle East and in Indochina, and for exposure of the collusion between the West and the racist regimes in southern Africa. The Conference considered in depth the economic aspects of the struggle being waged by the young states.

Later on, at the Fourth Conference (Algiers, 1973), the views of the newly-free countries on problems of economic development were synthesised into an integral programme of struggle for the elimination of inequitable international economic relations. The demands of the young states for the establishment of a new international economic order were also written into the documents of the Fifth Conference (Colombo, 1976). Vietnam, whose people have won such a brilliant victory in the fight against US imperialism, joined the movement at that time, this marking one

of the most politically important events at that Conference.

In the 1970s the movement could not only boast certain achievements, but had met with definite difficulties, which, to a certain extent, were determined by its highly heterogeneous composition. These difficulties were aggravated by various negative external factors. For example, on the eve of the Sixth Conference (Havana, 1979) the forces hostile to the movement made attempts to play down the anti-imperialist tune of the movement, to frustrate its forum on Cuba—a socialist state—and to compel its participants to cease their co-operation with the progressive forces of the world. Although over one hundred amendments and supplements were introduced into the draft Declaration prepared by Cuba (which, on the whole, weakened the anti-imperialist line of the document), the Declaration has succeeded in preserving its progressive trend. The overwhelming majority of the participants in the nonaligned movement censured the imperialist West most sharply at the Conference.

Despite the mounting onslaught against the movement by the forces hostile to it, at the conference of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Nonaligned Countries (Delhi, February 1981), notwithstanding differences in opinion as regards the problems of world development, the delegates expressed consensus in the Declaration on the need to lessen international tension, discontinue the arms race, and eliminate the vestiges of colonialism and racism. The nonaligned

countries sharply condemned the doctrine of a "limited nuclear war" put forward by the USA and its attempts to obliterate the differences between nuclear and conventional weapons. At the same time, the heterogeneous nature of the movement was evident in the various approaches of its members to the developments in Afghanistan. A representative of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan expressed profound regret that the participants in the Conference had been drawn into the discussion of the so-called "Afghan issue" and evaluated it as an attempt of certain circles within the nonaligned movement to interfere in the domestic affairs of one of its full-fledged members. The statement issued by the Afghan delegation stressed that only direct negotiations between the parties concerned, on the basis of the proposals made by the Afghan government on May 14, 1980, can contribute to the political settlement of the problem.

The Conference supported Soviet proposals for a general just settlement in the Middle East and on converting Southeast Asia into a region of durable peace and stability and the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace without foreign military bases. In their speeches the participants emphasised that the proposals on the Persian Gulf advanced by the Soviet Union are aimed at ensuring peace, security and the sovereign rights of the states in that region.

Much attention at the Conference of Foreign Ministers in Delhi was again given to problems of economic development faced by nonaligned countries. The documents and speeches by the Ministers pointed out that the industrialised capitalist states are seeking to solve problems brought about by economic and financial crises at the expense of the newly-free states by means of non-equivalent exchange of commodities, trade tariffs, and other discriminatory measures.

A retrospective glance at the development of the nonaligned movement at its 20th anniversary allows us to conclude that the ideas and concepts formulated by its founders not only laid the groundwork for and determined its basic principles, as stated by the participants in the Delhi Conference, but also served as a powerful factor in the fight of the newly-free countries for peace and security of nations, against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, racism and apartheid, and for political and economic independence of the young states.



From the very outset, two political lines emerged as regards the nonaligned

movement: the socialist community's support of the movement and the imperialist powers' attempts to undermine it, supported by the divisive policies of Peking.

Imperialism, the United States and its NATO partners above all, have sought to use the nonaligned movement, or at least some of its members, in their global strategy of struggle against world socialism, counterposing it to the forces of national liberation. With this aim in view, political blackmail and economic pressures, including the mechanism of "aid" to the newly-free countries, have been applied unscrupulously.

In reply to the refusal by the overwhelming majority of the newly-free countries to join a military-political alliance with the West, the latter denounced neutralism and the idea of nonalignment as "shortsighted and immoral". The young states which refused to follow in the wake of the Western policy were regarded as hostile, and a "position of strength" policy was pursued vis-à-vis these recalcitrants. The essence of this imperialist policy was quite clearly expounded in a book by a West German political scientist who openly stated that the Federal Republic of Germany "should not help the countries which reject the Western way of development, and on the contrary, it is necessary to assist only those who, along with us,

take upon themselves definite obligations within NATO."¹

Having failed to achieve its aims by means of diktat and frontal attacks against the nonaligned movement, Western strategists have been forced to resort to more refined and circumspect methods.

In the latter half of the 1960s, the West began to pursue a "flexible" policy vis-à-vis the developing countries which consisted of a combination of "support, pressure and alienation". Taking into account the heterogeneity of the nonaligned movement, the deepening of the process of political differentiation of the states, the varying degrees of readiness expressed by the ruling quarters of the nonaligned countries to confront imperialism, US political scientists came up with a doctrine of "intermediate orientation" as a means of bringing pressure to bear on the nonaligned movement. The chief aim of the doctrine was to frustrate rapprochement between the nonaligned states and the socialist countries, and to preserve as long as possible, the former's status as the periphery of the world capitalist

system. Such ideological prerequisites are in conformity with the desire of the ruling quarters in the imperialist countries to lead the nonaligned movement astray from an active struggle against imperialism and neocolonialism and against the arms race, and to channel it along the path of "equidistance" from the two world systems. According to *Al-Yaum*, a Lebanese paper, the nonaligned countries have resolutely denounced the attempts by imperialism to push the nonaligned movement toward such a "neutral attitude" to the forces of aggression and war, and to counterpose it to the national liberation and progressive forces.

The pursuance of the so-called flexible policy directed at the gradual "rapprochement" of imperialism and the nonaligned countries and the attempt at the isolation of the latter from the progressive forces and the world socialist system have also proved ineffective.

During the second half of the last decade, the imperialist powers have displayed overt hostility toward the nonaligned movement. The failure of the imperialists' attempts to impose their will on the nonaligned countries and the powerful upswing in the national liberation movement, the increasing number of countries with progressive regimes, and the intensified struggle of the young states for the establishment of a new international economic order have resulted in a tougher line pursued by Western states vis-à-vis the nonaligned movement, especially in respect of those of its participants who take a consistent anti-imperialist stance. At the time, in-

fluential papers in the West often called the nonaligned countries "an alliance of beggars" or "a tyrannical majority", which condemned the world of the "rich", demanding their share of the money. Finally, the instability of the international economic situation also was blamed on the nonaligned countries.

At the turn of the 1970s, the continuation of the arms race, fresh military conflicts, undeclared wars, support for terroristic dictatorships, and the declaration of vast areas of Asia and Africa as the spheres of "vital interest" have once again taken the upper hand in the policy of imperialism. A study on the military significance of a possible crisis in the world order in the 1980s carried out by order of the Pentagon openly stated that to preserve its interests the USA is prepared to use force against the newly-free countries.

Simultaneous attempts are being made within the US academic community to elaborate the "latest" concepts portraying the nonaligned movement as an "ally" of the West on the basis of the bonds which allegedly exist between the so-called capitalist "centre"

¹ *Die Entwicklungslander und unsere Hilfe, zur Entwicklungspolitik der CDU-SCU, Bonn, 1961, pp. 13-14.*

and its "periphery", i. e., the developing countries. In other words, under the guise of setting up a political alliance between the newly-free countries and West, it seeks to establish its control over different areas of the world. The imperialists want to impose their will upon the nonaligned countries and to isolate the nonaligned movement from the forces of world socialism and progress.

Like imperialism, Peking is also striving to undermine the nonaligned movement and split its ranks, although the attitude of the Chinese leaders toward the nonaligned movement was not invariable at different stages. Initially Peking lacked a clear-cut political line vis-à-vis the movement. The idea of nonalignment as it was carried out proved unacceptable to the Chinese political scheme of postwar international relations. The Chinese leaders favoured the convocation of "another Bandung", hoping to impose their ideological and political platform on the newly-free countries and take the leading position in the movement. Peking needed the support of African and Asian countries to attain its hegemonic aims. Later on, relying on the concept of dividing the world into the "rich" and "poor", the North and the South, it sought to place the USA and Soviet Union on an equal footing. Contraposing the USSR and USA to the newly-free countries, China tried to force the latter to give up the principle of peaceful coexistence. Selling itself as a "genuine guardian" of the peoples in the newly-free countries, China, as its leaders believed, would automatically become the leader of the developing world.

In the latter half of the 1960s, the Peking rulers changed their attitude towards the nonaligned movement altogether, clearly delimiting "friendly" and "unfriendly" countries, and putting a stake on the development of close contacts with conservative, authoritarian, and militaristic regimes. Peking's appeals to start a "people's war" against those governments which were not to its liking, primarily against those which played a prominent part in the movement, were accompanied by provocations and overt subversive actions. Many Asian and African countries became the victims of Peking's adventurists.

Peking's betrayal of the interests of the national liberation struggle and its double-dealing with the peoples struggling for freedom was felt particularly during this period.

The nonaligned countries, the leaders of which still believed in the sincerity of Peking's anti-imperialist catchwords and its calls for developing

friendship and cooperation, later drastically decreased their contacts with China, and some of them even severed diplomatic relations with Peking. China's head-on attacks against the nonaligned movement have not yielded the desired results. On the contrary, its openly hegemonic line has almost completely isolated it in the international arena.

After the Peking leaders suffered a setback in implementing their hegemonic aims vis-à-vis the nonaligned countries, in the 1970s they drastically changed their policy as regards nonalignment. Three important aspects have to be mentioned here. First, Peking has been going out of its way to impose a policy of anti-Sovietism on the movement, to depict the Soviet Union as the "worst and most dangerous enemy" of the young states, and to draw the non-aligned countries away from the struggle against imperialism by its anti-Sovietism. Second, the Chinese leaders began to flirt with nonaligned countries, seeking to curry favour with the majority of them, asking them to "forget" the past. Third, Peking has made a move from the "left" to the right, from ultra-revolutionary catchwords to collusion with imperialist reaction, from leftist appeals to destroy the "paper tiger"—US imperialism—immediately to open military and political alliance with the latter. Banking on a war, the Chinese leaders vigorously support the imperialists' escalation of the arms race, the strengthening of aggressive military-political blocs, and whipping up international tension.

Despite the fitting rebuff given by Vietnam to the aggressive actions of China, the Peking leaders did not abandon their attempts to "teach a lesson" to those countries which are unwilling to submit to China's diktat. Peking continues its interference in the domestic affairs of many nonaligned countries, Kampuchea and Afghanistan above all.

It should be recalled that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the nonaligned countries at the Delhi Conference decided that all problems connected with the developments concerning those countries must be solved by peaceful means.

Acting together or in parallel, world imperialism and Peking's hegemonism are trying to push the nonaligned movement away from its anti-imperialist positions, weaken the favourable influence exerted by countries of progressive orientation, undermine cooperation between the nonaligned countries and the socialist states and impose aims on the former which are alien to them.

From the very beginning, the socialist states, the world communist and workers' movement, and all progressive

and democratic forces welcomed the emergence onto the international political scene of the nonaligned countries with their peaceful programme.

The attitude of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community toward the nonaligned movement has always been built on a firm, stable foundation which has never been influenced by expedient or passing considerations. Socialist and non-aligned countries take common or similar stands on the basic problems of our day and age, on the solution of which the destinies of peace and progress on earth depend.

The Soviet Union has invariably been loyal to the Leninist policy of strengthening solidarity with the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It resolutely supports the forces of progress, democracy and national emancipation. At the same time, the Soviet Union does not seek any advantages for itself, nor does it hunt for concessions, work for political domination, or seek for military bases abroad.

The socialist states' policy of supporting the newly-free countries has been clearly manifest in different spheres of the international affairs, and has exerted a favourable influence on positive developments within the non-aligned movement, the growth of its ranks, and the consolidation of the positions held by the nonaligned countries on the world scene. During the past two decades after the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted on the initiative of the USSR, over fifty young states have appeared on the political map of the world, and more than seventy million people have won their freedom, putting an end forever to colonial slavery. Although about twenty countries and territories still remain under Western domination, the mounting liberation struggle in Namibia, South Africa, the countries of the Caribbean, Oceania, and other areas of the world testify to the inevitable vic-

tory of the peoples' struggle for national emancipation.

As far as the problems of war and peace, the limitation of the arms race and disarmament, detente and cooperation are concerned, the stands taken by the Soviet Union, other socialist states and the nonaligned countries are basically the same, as can be seen from the documents and materials of the non-aligned movement. More than 110 states which possess no nuclear weapons, have become signatories to the non-proliferation treaty. As is known, the signing of that treaty began on the initiative of the USSR. The proposals to

set up nuclear-free zones and zones of peace and cooperation in different areas of the world have also been met with understanding by the peace-loving world public. There are plans to declare as nuclear-free zones areas in Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean along with Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. The Soviet Union has reiterated its readiness to assist the implementation of the decisions taken by the UN General Assembly in every way possible to convene an International Conference on the Indian Ocean with the aim of elaborating practical measures to turn the latter into a zone of peace.

The nonaligned countries support the initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries aimed at radically improving the international situation, removing the threat of war, and consolidating the peace and security of nations. This has been reaffirmed in the documents signed in the course of the negotiations between the Soviet leaders and the leaders of nonaligned countries.

The policy of strengthening solidarity and cooperation with the nonaligned countries has been given a fresh impetus by the decisions of the 26th Congress of the CPSU. The Congress has reaffirmed the invariable loyalty of the Soviet Union to the ideas and practices of internationalist solidarity with the struggles for national emancipation and social progress. The Soviet Union will continue to cooperate with the countries which have freed themselves from colonial dependence and promote their important role in world politics as sovereign states. While stressing the significance of the nonaligned movement in the contemporary world, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasised at the 26th Party Congress that "its strength stems from the stand it takes against imperialism and colonialism, and against war and aggression. We are convinced that the key to any further heightening of its role in world politics—and this we would welcome—is its dedication to these basic principles".

In a bid to isolate the Soviet Union from the nonaligned countries, the USA recently launched a campaign accusing the USSR of supporting "international terrorism". What the US means by this is the support the Soviet Union renders to peoples fighting for their national and social liberation. The perfidious attempt to put terrorism and the legitimate struggle of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples against imperialism on an equal footing is a gross attack upon the participants in the non-aligned movement, the overwhelming

majority of which are states which emerged as a result of a successful struggle for national emancipation. It is precisely the imperialists and their accomplices who act as international terrorists.

Under the guise of this alleged struggle against terrorism, US imperialism and the reactionary quarters of some other countries, encouraged by it, have launched a global offensive against the national liberation movement. They also carry out acts of terrorism against countries which are members of the non-aligned movement. Under such conditions, the need to consolidate the unity of the nonaligned countries and strengthen their anti-imperialist, anti-military stance is becoming especially acute.

The past two decades have demonstrated that the more consolidated the ranks of the nonaligned movement and the firmer the interaction with all the progressive forces of the present day, the more weighty the contribution it can make to the struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism and for international detente and universal peace.

U. S. CAMPAIGN AGAINST TERRORISM VEILS AGGRESSIVE POLICIES

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 81 pp 25-27

[Article by Vasili Yefremov]

[Text] **T**he past few years saw new successes for the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The sphere of imperialist domination has diminished considerably as a result of the further worsening of the general crisis of capitalism and the crumbling of imperialism's colonial system, which now is virtually nonexistent in the classical form.

Under the circumstances, the most aggressive circles of imperialism, in the United States above all, are increasingly resorting to the use of force in opposing the national liberation movements and to a policy of blackmail and threats. They cloak their activities with all sorts of political and ideological concepts, doctrines, and shady propaganda campaigns. When describing the aggressiveness of those circles and their readiness to endanger the mankind's vital interests for the sake of their narrow and selfish objectives, Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress: "With utter contempt for the rights and aspirations of nations, they are trying to portray the liberation struggle of the masses as 'terrorism'. Indeed, they have set out to achieve the unachievable—to set up a barrier to the progressive changes in the world, and to again become the rulers of the peoples' destiny."

SMOKE SCREEN

The US ruling circles are deliberately whipping up the campaign of hostility towards the USSR by claiming it to be party to "international terrorism". The campaign was launched in Washington by the "highest echelons of power". President Reagan has declared that the Soviet Union is allegedly to blame for all terrorism, as it aims at promoting a

world revolution to establish a world socialist or communist state. With this objective in view, the President asserted, the Soviet Union not only defends and arms puppet governments and states where terrorism and genocide reign but instals brutal dictatorships everywhere with an eye to further expansion. In an interview given to *Il Giornale d'Italia*, US Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig said: "I maintain that at present the phenomenon which poses primary danger and is the primary source of concern for all the free countries is the upsurge of international terrorism and the related instances of unlawful interference—the so-called wars of national liberation waged by the Soviet Union and its accomplices." He accused the Soviet Union of "training, financing and equipping international terrorism" and declared that for that reason the problem of international terrorism was to take the place of the human rights problem in US foreign policy.

The United States has even set up a Senate subcommittee "on security and terrorism" which has already begun public hearings on the so-called problem of terrorism. Its sessions hear many bombastic pronouncements about how Washington adheres to the struggle against this dangerous international phenomenon and much slander directed against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It is indicative, however, that neither the President nor the Secretary of State, nor the Senate subcommittee can substantiate the accusations they have made against the Soviet Union with any convincing arguments. When the *New York Times* asked people with access to US intelligence documents to cite facts of

cooperation with terrorism, the unequivocal answer was that the United States had practically no data to confirm Secretary of State Haig's accusations that the Soviet Union was training,

arming and financing international terrorists.

The *Daily World* wrote in connection with the US Administration's new political provocation that every president seeks to mask the genuine aims of the US imperialist policy with the help of hypocritical and demagogic slogans, such as the defence of human rights. President Carter expatiated on. That attempt has failed. The new Administration has chosen the slogan of opposing so-called international terrorism as a smoke screen for invigorating its aggressive policy.

It is not only a matter of camouflage, however. The chronic illness of imperialism, which back in 1917 declared the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia "unlawful", lies at the heart of the matter. In the twenties it sought to interpret terrorism as equivalent to the workers' movement. In the thirties, its mouthpiece, the raving Führer of the nazis, "wedded" terrorism to communism. And now it persists not only in identifying terrorism with communism but also stating that it is tied to the national liberation forces and everything which has to do with rejecting the bourgeois way of life, bourgeois politics and the western world outlook.

To follow the logic of official Washington today, the collapse of the world colonial system and the emergence of dozens of new independent states inhabited by 2,000 million people have been brought about by "international terrorism" rather than by the class and liberation struggle of the peoples.

Back in 1917 Lenin wrote: "No power on earth can restore the old serfdom in Asia or wipe out the heroic democracy of the masses in the Asiatic and semi-Asiatic countries."¹ That same heroic democratic spirit inspired hundreds of thousands of patriots in colonies and dependences to the struggle against imperialism and colonialism and for independence and social progress. It was objective historical processes and the struggle for national and social emancipation rather than the "export of revolution" from the Soviet Union that brought about the victory of

the forces of national and social liberation in dozens of Asian, African and Latin American countries whose peoples now want to be masters of their own destinies.

"INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM" AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

But what do the "champions of human rights" and the stage managers of another anti-Soviet campaign mean by the notion of "international terrorism" that they had invented?

US State Department spokesman Dyess believes, for instance, that "international terrorism" implies the propaganda and material support for what the Russians call national liberation wars. However, you will look in vain for such a definition in international documents or UN resolutions. Such a notion can never be included in them because it contravenes international law and common sense.

International legal documents, such as the 1937 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, the 1971 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Terroristic Acts and the Resolution of the 27th UN General Assembly on "Measures to Prevent International Terrorism..." as well as many others implicitly deny any relationship between national liberation movements and terrorism.

The problem of international terrorism was discussed by the 27th UN General Assembly in 1973. It was recognised that international terrorism first and foremost included attempts on the lives of heads of state or government, diplomats, and other officials organised by foreign circles, that is, such actions as, for instance, the assassination of Soviet diplomats Vorovsky and Voikov in the 1920s, the murder of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo (now Zaire) and Salvador Allende in Chile, attempts on the life of Fidel Castro and other statesmen and politicians. Today international terrorism is practiced in many forms, such as the hijacking of planes, seizure of hostages, and explosions on the premises of foreign missions and progressive organisations.

As for the national liberation struggle, including its armed forms, it has nothing in common with international terrorism. Moreover, it is a legitimate right of the people, which, incidentally, is very often violated by the real terrorists—the imperialists and counter-revolutionaries. One forceful example of real international terrorism is the financial support provided by the United States, China and Pakistan to armed gangs who are sent across the border into sovereign Afghanistan.

The right of people to decide their destinies is stipulated in the UN Charter and other fundamental international documents. For instance, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe reads that "all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development".

The struggle waged against colonialism and racism is also absolutely legitimate from the point of view of international law. The UN General Assembly has repeatedly affirmed the inalienable right of the colonial nations to struggle with all means at their disposal against the colonial powers which suppress their striving after freedom and independence (Resolution 2621/XXV). The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted by the 25th UN General Assembly reads that all states should render help to the United Nations and also, in keeping with the Charter, to the oppressed nations in their legitimate struggle for the speediest abolition of colonialism or any other form of foreign dominion.

The Soviet Union has always advocated the strict and complete observance of the commonly recognised norms of international law which condemn imperialist brigandry, diktat in relations between sovereign states, and the establishment of any "sphere of influence".

The application of these norms in relations with the emergent states, Leonid Brezhnev pointed out, means approximately the following in the present-day situation:

—To recognise the right of every nation to run its own internal affairs without any interference from the outside; to renounce attempts at imposing any form of dominion or hegemony over them or at including them in some power's "sphere of interests".

—To respect strictly these countries' territorial integrity and the inviolability of their borders; not to support from the outside any separatist movement aiming at dividing these countries.

—To unconditionally recognise the right of every African, Asian and Latin American country to take equal part in international affairs and to develop relations with all countries.

—To recognise fully and unconditionally the sovereign right of these states to their natural resources; to recognise in deed their complete equality in international economic relations; to support their efforts aimed at eliminating the vestiges of colonialism and to combat racism and apartheid in keeping with the known resolutions of the UN.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 584.

—To respect the status of non-alignment chosen by the majority of African, Asian and Latin American countries; not to draw them into military and political alliances of the powers.

The sponsors of the campaign of "struggle against international terrorism" resort to the unseemly trick by equating terrorism with the just struggle of peoples for national, economic and social emancipation. Furthermore, the United States itself increasingly resorts to foreign policy acts that can be characterised as international terrorism. Suffice it to recall the Vietnam war, punitive operations in Latin American countries, the sending of mercenaries to quench the national liberation movements in African countries, the armed venture in Iran and finally the unceasing provocations against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

THEIR CREED, MEANS AND METHODS

US Secretary of State Alexander Haig, a retired general, states that US political and social systems should be a model for everybody. The US utterly believes in its values and its institutions, and its military might should be maintained to ensure an international atmosphere in which these values and institutions should develop, he added.

What means does the US Administration intend to use to make the world respect "American political and social institutions"? The aforementioned pronouncement by Haig shows that the US is counting on force. It is only natural that statements by representatives of the US Administration are accompanied by calls to strengthen the army, to reinforce and extend the powers of the CIA.

The New York Times elaborated on this theme by stating that the American leaders have introduced the CIA into the underground world of international diplomacy, between the world of the soldier and the world of the diplomat.

The nature of CIA activities in the field of international terrorism was forcefully illustrated by the US News and World Report in November 1977. According to its data, in the period from 1961 to 1976 the CIA carried out about 900 major secret operations against "undesirable" leaders and even governments. The CIA had a hand in the savage murders of Che Guevara, Chilean General Carlos Prats, Bolivia's former president General Juan Torres, and many others in Latin America. Among its victims in Africa were Patrice Lumumba, Amilcar Cabral, Eduardo Mondlane, and in Asia, Solomon Bandaranaike. The CIA masterminded fascist putsch in Chile is far from being the first fruit of the organisation's perfidious activities. As much as twenty years before that, in the early fifties, it staged

the overthrow of the Musaddiq government in Iran. The CIA also helped overthrow democratic governments in Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, and Ghana.

In December 1960, on Soviet initiative, the UN General Assembly adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This event was a testimony to the alteration of the alignment of world forces in favour of socialism and the forces of national liberation and social progress. In particular, the Declaration called for an end to all military actions or repressive measures of any kind directed against independent nations.

It is no exaggeration to state that in the course of the more than twenty years since the Declaration was signed, the United States has flagrantly trampled upon its principles. In recent years the US declared almost the entire world to be a "zone of its national interests". Under this pretext, it blockaded Iran and is continuously staging provocations against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Washington has voiced its resolve to send its "rapid deployment force" to any part of the world to suppress national liberation movements. All this, in the opinion of the US Administration, is part of the struggle against "international terrorism".

TERRORISM CHAIN REACTION

The US Administration's course towards "struggle against international terrorism" (read—the course towards international terrorism) gave a "second wind" to the South African racists who pursue a policy of governmental terrorism with regard to the South African indigenous population and the neighbouring front-line states. With Washington's complete approval, the racist rulers of Pretoria foiled the Geneva Conference on Namibia and have stepped up their attacks on SWAPO, the representatives of which have been branded "terrorists" by Pretoria and Washington. At the same time, South Africa has undertaken a fresh murderous raid on Angola and Mozambique. What is more, South African Minister of Foreign Affairs R. Botha made a cynical statement in his message to UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim to the effect that the South African army would continue carrying out punitive operations against "terrorists" in Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. In late March 1981, US Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Walker and other American officials held a secret meeting in Morocco with head of the anti-Angolan terrorist gro-

uping UNITA Sawimbi, a long-time CIA agent. The meeting discussed a wide range of problems related to southern Africa, and also practical issues to expand UNITA's actions against Angola. Then Sawimbi was invited to visit Washington by the US Administration, according to the Johannesburg Sunday Times, to help the US government work out a new policy in Southwest Africa. It did not take long for this policy to take shape.

Inspired by Washington, the Israeli extremists also have stepped up their subversive activities against sovereign Lebanon and the PLO. The major blow was aimed at the national patriotic forces of Lebanon and the Palestine resistance movement, which Washington and, naturally, Israel declared to be "terrorist". All this when the UN has recognised the PLO as the only legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, and 115 states have already recognised the PLO in this capacity.

Two months after being inaugurated President Ronald Reagan publicly spoke of his intention to continue sending American arms to the counterrevolutionary gangs which seek to invade Afghanistan from Pakistani and Iranian territories. Fawning on Washington, the Sadat regime in Egypt was also increasingly engaging in undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and has officially stated its readiness to help train the mercenary gangs.

Washington's policy of support for "international terrorism" is in perfect harmony with the activities of Peking. Recent years have seen stepped up provocations by pro-Chinese anti-government groupings in Burma, India, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines. Peking remains a major organiser of acts of terror against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It sends arms and money to the Pol Pot gangs and stages military provocations against the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. China's subversive activities go far beyond the Asian continent. Afrique-Asie magazine, quoting Western diplomatic circles in Pretoria, reported that Peking had informed South Africa's Prime Minister Pieter Botha about its readiness to "support Pretoria's efforts in destabilising the Angolan government with the aim of toppling it". China declared itself ready to send its advisers to Namibia to help the South African occupationist authorities conduct the operation.

The emergence of the so-called problem of international terrorism, which

succeeded Carter's notorious campaign in "defence of human rights", shows that imperialism is loath to reconcile itself to the fact that the world it has been governing for so long refuses to do its bidding and is resolved to follow its own, independent path. The course of historical development is irreversible, and no spurious concepts or propaganda campaigns can turn back the clock.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1981

CSO: 1812/37

ROLE OF STATE IN ECONOMIES OF SOCIALIST ORIENTED COUNTRIES

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 81 pp 29-31

[Article by Gleb Smirnov, Dr. Sc. (Economics)]

[Text]

The trend towards a greater role for the state in economic life is typical of all newly-free Asian and African countries and is of an objective nature. The overcoming of backwardness inherited from colonialism, the radical advance of productive forces, the remaking of archaic socio-economic structures, economic forms and relations of production, the elimination of poverty and a higher standard of living for the bulk of population are very difficult

or simply impossible without a national development strategy, without the mobilisation of all material and financial resources, and without the regulation of economic life on the whole and the management of separate elements of social reproduction. In the overwhelming majority of these countries there is no other force except the state which is capable of solving the task of economic decolonisation, of opposing the expansion of the monopoly and state-monopoly capital of the former mother countries and other imperialist powers. This capital is financially powerful, possesses organisational structures, experience, personnel, and scientific and technological potential.

The developing countries being incorporated within the system of the world capitalist economy, their multistructural economies are evolving spontaneously towards capitalism (despite all reservations about the dependent and negative nature of this development). That is why the role of the national state in capitalist-oriented countries is reduced to active stimulation of the spontaneous process and the struggle against economic and political forces which hinder the latter. In this group of countries, the tasks of socio-economic development are solved, first and foremost, on the basis of private enterprise, which is supported by the state in every possible way, in particular by creating state-owned factories and investing government capital in branches and projects which are unprofitable for private capital; drawing petty commodity-producers, semi-feudal economies, etc., into capitalist relations of production. In many cases economic and technological assistance of imperialist states is employed and beneficial conditions are created for the intensification of foreign monopoly capital in the national economy.

The situation in socialist-oriented developing countries is quite different, since the revolutionary-democratic state

seeks to limit and regulate the spontaneous process of the growth of capitalist relations, overcome economic backwardness mainly at the expense of the state, rather than private enterprise, completely eliminate big private ownership of the means of production, and unite petty commodity-producers along cooperative lines. The socialist-oriented state assumes special functions when it opposes economic expansion of foreign monopoly capital and simultaneously makes use of its financial resources, scientific and technological potential and the potential of the international division of labour for the sake of raising national productive forces.

Thus, the determining role of the revolutionary-democratic state in the socio-economic life of socialist-oriented countries is formed as an objective necessity stemming from the very essence of this progressive path of development. It is impossible to create prerequisites for the transition to socialist construction in future without the active influence of the political superstructure.

The objective necessity for the revolutionary-democratic state to discharge its socio-economic functions is combined with the existence of definite possibilities for doing so. Countries with a multistructural economy have embarked and continue to embark on the road of socialist orientation. In these countries precapitalist systems and classes and social strata representing them no longer correspond to the contemporary type of productive forces and the social organisation of labour. They are unable to put an end to the nation's backwardness. As for the national capitalist system, it has not yet become predominant: in the majority of cases, financially and organisationally weak local bourgeoisie cannot ensure the restructuring and advance of the productive forces on a nationwide scale.

The absence of economically strong classes and their coalitions in the countries of socialist orientation enables the revolutionary-democratic state actively to influence the course of socio-economic development. Mirroring the interests of the broad working masses and middle strata of society, including petty and partially middle bourgeoisie (as applied to the level of capitalist development in these countries), the socialist-oriented state has a free hand, to a certain extent, in shaping and pursuing its socio-economic policy. In other words, the state as a political superstructure enjoys a certain independence from the multistructural economic basis and is capable, on a greater

scale than in the countries with dominating systems, to interfere in the reproduction of material conditions in the life of society, and social relations, directing it in conformity with the socio-economic orientation of the powers that be.

The generalisation of the experience of economic transformations in socialist-oriented African and Asian countries makes it possible to single out basic trends and methods of exerting influence by revolutionary-democratic states on the process of social reproduction and define the determinative role of the state in the socio-economic development or, in other words, its economic functions.

Let us characterise the most important of them.

The revolutionary-democratic state undertakes the elaboration of the strategy of socio-economic development. In the latter's framework long-term goals and the main ways and means of their achievement are worked out. As a rule, the strategy is reflected in the policy-making documents of the ruling parties and also in 10-15-year development plans.¹ The 1967 Arusha Declaration which proclaimed the goals of socio-economic and political transformations in Tanzania, the Algerian Charters of 1964 and 1976, the Programme of the 1976 Ethiopian national-democratic revolution and others are cases in point. It is of importance that these and similar policy-making documents embrace a wide range of problems and prospects of economic and social development. In addition, the state elaborates medium-term and short-term plans and programmes which contain more or less concrete tasks for a certain period, proceeding from the adopted strategy. It should be pointed out that at present not all socialist-oriented countries are characterised by planning which determines basic proportions and rates of development of the national economy. It is of a specific nature and includes elements of forecasts concerning various aspects and components of social reproduction which, in the conditions of multistructural system, are strongly influenced by the market mechanism. On the whole, however, planning has been playing a rather substantial and growing part in the overall system of the state administration of economic development.

Measures of direct (administrative) and indirect regulation of economic life are important in this system. Their scope is rather broad, although not all these measures are applied completely and effectively. From the viewpoint of political economy, they are directed at restricting and weakening the spontaneous, market regulators of the reproduction process and channeling the latter in accordance with the national development strategy and plans. This is why regulation encompasses the activities of the private foreign and national capital, including that participating in mixed enterprises in the territory of the country, as well as the movement of capital abroad, monetary relationships and foreign trade.

To regulate the activities of private capital use is made of taxation and credits, as well as a system of early depreciation of assets. Regulation of prices, service charges and of wages is applied to a lesser degree to influence production and consumption, inasmuch as in conditions of multistructural economy and insignificant incorporation of the mass of petty commodity-producers in the commodity-and-money relations these measures often prove ineffective.

¹ The latter are also policy-making documents which declare in a general form the goals of development, rather than usual economic plans as applied to the conditions and socio-economic structures of the developing countries.

While discharging the abovementioned economic functions, the state acts as an apparatus of management and regulation of economic life, i. e., as a political superstructure. At the same time, however, it also acts as a direct participant in the process of social reproduction. What is meant here is business activity of the state of socialist orientation and the public sector in economy.

These activities at the present-day stage of the development of socialist-oriented countries should be regarded as the main economic function of the state which acts both as a superstructural institution and a "collective employer" (state property in the multistructural economy in socialist-oriented countries is not the property of all the people), i. e., it acts as a component of the economic basis. This predetermines the direct impact of the state, in the course of discharging this economic function, on the two facets of the reproduction process—reproduction of material conditions of life in society (the economic aspect) and reproduction of social relationships (the social aspect).

While examining the economic aspect of reproduction, it should be emphasised, first and foremost, that the public sector, which embraces both the sphere of material production and the key elements and branches of economic infrastructure and the sphere of circulation, assumes a decisive role in the advance of the productive forces simultaneously with development along the non-capitalist road, the weakening of positions of private foreign capital and of national capital in some countries. More often than not the public sector accounts for more than 50 per cent and sometimes (e. g., in Algeria) more than 75 per cent of the GNP.

Business activity by the state, being more progressive as compared with the private capitalist form of organisation of the productive forces, meets the interests of the majority of social groups in those countries and provides conditions for the conduct of an independent anti-imperialist economic policy. Let us reiterate that in socialist-oriented countries, as in developing countries in general, there is no other economic force except the public sector which could in reality oppose the power of transnationals and financial trusts, and solve the most complex tasks of the restructuring and the advancement of the economy.

The impulses towards the creation and development of the public sector emanate from the political superstructure. Later on, with the strengthening of its positions in diverse spheres and branches of the economy, a complicated mechanism of interaction between the public sector as a part of economic basis somewhat isolated from the state and the latter as a superstructural institution is formed. At the early stages of non-capitalist development the superstructure plays a most active part in the functioning of the mechanism, this being carried out through the economic policy and administrative and managerial activities of the state. Then the public sector comes to exert an increasing influence on the superstructural institutions of the socialist-oriented countries, determining major directions of the restructuring of their economic basis and their formational development.

This article does not set out to examine the channels of this influence. Let us only stress that the general scheme of remaking the economic basis of socialist-oriented countries is apparently the following: organisation "from above" and expansion of the sphere of activity of the public sector which possesses the nature of the state-capitalist system since it coexists with the private capitalist sector, cooperates with it, albeit on a limited scale, and contributes to reproduction of private capital in the economy of the country: the public sector takes the leading

positions from the viewpoint of the reproduction of the material conditions of society and the formation of social relations (the positions of other types of sectors in the multistructural economy neither reduce nor expand); the structural characteristic of the public sector acquires transitional features (state property is no longer state-capitalist property in the full sense of the word; neither is it the property of the whole people); the public sector affects the relations of ownership of the means of production, the relations of exchange and distribution of the social product and the income of the entire national economy, increasingly narrowing the reproduction of private capital, on the one hand, and poverty, on the other; while preserving its transitional character, the public sector becomes the predominant system which determines the formational development towards an economy based on common property (simultaneously with cooperative property).

Business activity of the state is closely linked with another important economic function—interference in credit-and-monetary, banking and financial systems. While exercising this interference, the state again plays two roles: as an economic management body and a direct participant in the reproduction process (at the level of the sphere of money circulation and the formation of financial resources).

The following methods and areas of state interference in this sphere can be singled out:

—Mobilisation of financial resources: a) through the state financial system (taxes and other revenues); b) through the country's credit and banking system; c) by means of profits and depreciation funds of enterprises in the public sector; d) by means of monetary emission on the basis of credit liabilities of the state (deficit financing).

—The utilisation of financial resources: a) redistribution of resources within the framework of the public sector; b) the channelling of resources from other sectors of the economy to the development of production in the public sector; c) the use of financial resources by their allocation from the state budget or their redistribution to develop other sectors of the economy; d) financing of the non-production sphere, i. e., social infrastructure and various social needs.

In addition, in the majority of the developing countries external resources play an important role in the financing of the economy. This is why socialist-oriented states make use of this channel of affecting economic development as well. The overwhelming share of the external influx of resources (in the form of subsidies, credits and loans) is appropriated by the state—directly or through enterprises and organisations of the public sector—and is used to finance projects implemented in accordance with the state plans and development programmes.

A specific place in the overall system of the state functions in regulating social reproduction belongs to its legislative, political, organisational and administrative activities directed at reshaping agrarian relations. The curbing of large-scale private landownership and the transfer of the land to those who till it constitute the basic principle of changing agrarian structures in socialist-oriented countries. This, however, is only the initial stage of agrarian transformation. The next stage, perhaps an even more complex one, is the unification of farmers assigned to solve the two most urgent tasks: an economic one—to ensure the development of agricultural production and raise its marketability, and a social one—to limit the possibility for the emergence and growth of farms

of the capitalist type, and to eliminate any forms of exploitation of man by man in the agrarian sector.

Agrarian transformations have been launched in all socialist-oriented countries, and they are different in terms of scope, depth and tactics. Nevertheless, some more or less common features can be pinpointed. Unification of farmers in state-owned enterprises is carried out mainly via nationalisation of big estates owned by foreigners or through the development of new lands, which is financed by the state (the self-managed enterprises in Algeria, the Sisal Corporation in Tanzania, specialised state farms growing coffee, sugar cane and other cultures in the Congo are cases in point). Such enterprises are not set up on land confiscated from big feudals and landowners. As a rule, this land is distributed among landless and land-hungry peasants in conformity with the principle "Land to Those Who Till It" with subsequent incorporation into various cooperatives (this is practiced in Algeria, South Yemen, Syria).

The restructuring of the agrarian sector in the countries of socialist orientation poses a major task facing the revolutionary-democratic state. When the task is being solved, firstly, relations of production, social institutions and social psychology of the overwhelming majority of the population are broken radically. Secondly, the state faces the necessity to mobilise substantial resources to enhance the productivity of the agrarian sector, create a corresponding economic and social infrastructure and, finally, to support new types of farms—state and cooperative—which are unprecedented in the history of those countries. According to our estimates, the amount of these resources exceeds by dozens of times the income created in the agrarian sector itself and, as the experience gained by many socialist-oriented countries demonstrates, efficient agrarian transformations are possible only given mass-scale economic support by the state.

In conclusion, a few words should be said about one more important aspect of the impact exerted by the socialist-oriented state on the process of social reproduction,

on, which requires the mobilisation of considerable resources and constant organisational effort. We are referring to the development of the social infrastructure—schools and other educational institutions, hospitals, kindergartens and creches and so on—and the creation of personal consumption public funds, i. e., material benefits and services at the expense of the state (free schooling, textbooks and breakfasts for schoolchildren, medical care, social maintenance and so on). In paying out enormous sums of money (up to one sixth of its national income), the state pursues both social and economic aims, i. e., reproduction of the workforce.

The socialist-oriented state thus exerts a most direct and growing influence on the entire course of social reproduction. The range of its economic functions is broad enough. It includes the elaboration of a strategy of the socio-economic development, elements of the latter's planning, a series of measures for indirect regulating economic life, direct participation of the state in it as a collective entrepreneur, and a most active impact on the social aspect of reproduction.

Of course, it would be erroneous to contend that the state interferes in economy in socialist-oriented countries alone. This phenomenon is typical for all developing countries. Unlike the capitalist-oriented countries in many of which economic life is regulated by the state, there is an obvious trend in the socialist-oriented countries towards such an expansion of the economic functions of

the state when the latter is able to affect the main processes of reproduction of the material conditions of society and social relations. The activities of the state of a revolutionary-democratic type as a body of economic management and direct participant in the production process largely accord with the interests of the majority of the population, above all the broad masses of the working people in town and countryside and, in the final analysis, is designed to create the economic and social prerequisites for the transition of those countries to the building of socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1981

CSO: 1812/37

GROMYKO ADDRESSES CONFERENCE ON AFRICAN LIBERATION STRUGGLE

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 81 pp 44-45

[Article by Anatoliy Gromyko, Dr. Sc. (History)]

[Text] The 26th Congress of the CPSU will go down in history as a peace forum which counterposed to the adventuristic, threatening policies of imperialism a constructive programme of a further struggle to strengthen peace, preserve and deepen international detente, curb the arms race and avert a thermonuclear catastrophe. The initiatives set forth by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the Report of the Central Committee to the Congress, practically deals with all hot spots and all regions of the globe. Within the context of our meeting, I would like to say a few words about the situation in southern Africa. The increasing rapprochement, and downright conspiracy between the USA and the apartheid regime have been demonstrated by facts. The United States tops the list of foreign trade partners of South Africa, with a trade turnover of almost \$6,000 million. This means that the USA is an accomplice in protecting that citadel of colonialism and racism, a regime which barbarously oppresses millions of people. South African racists have illegally occupied Namibia and continue to strike out at neighbouring Angola. South Africa's special services, hand in glove with the CIA, took the remains of the defeated bands of UNITA under their patronage, arming them and dispatching saboteurs to perform acts of terrorism in Angola.

We fully agree with the statement made by Shehu Shagari, President of Nigeria, at his press conference in London on March 20, 1981, that the lifting of the ban on sending weapons to UNITA by the United States is a challenge not only to Angola but to

all of Africa and that this dangerous step could entail grave consequences.

Along with Nigeria and many other African and Asian states, the Soviet Union resolutely favours the elimination of the criminal regime of apartheid, the granting of genuine independence to the people of Namibia, and the discontinuation of imperialist interference in Angola, Mozambique and other African states. The USSR has invariably demanded the introduction of all-embracing, mandatory, strict sanctions against South Africa, and it continues to render efficient support to the fighters for national and social emancipation in that country.

This struggle is governed by the laws of historical development, and it is not this struggle which is creating tensions in the world. It is rather the refusal of the ruling quarters of the imperialist powers to recognise peoples' inalienable rights which is at fault here. In spite of historical logic, and the history of the war for independence which the US had to fight in the 1700s, in spite of the facts of our day and age, the new US Administration is going out of its way to put national liberation movements and "international terrorism" on an equal footing and to declare them both "unlawful". The untenability and bankruptcy of these attempts are self-evident.

Today as the young states strive to consolidate their political independence and create sound national economies, the Soviet Union considers promoting these processes in every way possible its internationalist duty. The 26th Congress of the CPSU reiterated that the Soviet Union favours the restructuring of international eco-

conomic relations along democratic lines and on principles of equality. We must take the real content of this problem into account—imperialism is responsible for the inequality in the world economic system and for the foreign economic difficulties faced by the developing countries.

Along with the other countries of the socialist community, the Soviet Union is developing large-scale, equitable, mutually beneficial cooperation with the young states, giving them aid, among other things, in building large industrial projects. Among the large enterprises recently commissioned, we can cite the As Saour hydro-energy complex in Syria which produces 70 per cent of all electrical energy in that country, the second section of the metallurgical plant in Algeria which has increased its annual capacity to two million tons of steel, an enterprise for the annual extraction of 2.5 million tons of bauxites in Guinea. Over 900 kilometres of oil pipelines have been built in Nigeria with Soviet technical assistance. The building of an iron-and-steel complex in Ajaokuta, the largest in Africa, has begun. The USSR has helped many young states in training their national personnel and sends its specialists there.

It is impossible to put an end to backwardness in the newly-free countries without putting an end to the arms race and dangerous relapses of the cold war, and without ensuring organic interconnection between detente and development. Meanwhile, imperialism spares no effort in tying the developing countries to its chariot, to exploit their national natural resources, and to use their territories for military and strategic aims, up to and including encouragement of domestic reactionaries and staging external aggressive actions. That is why the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries help build up the defensive capabilities of those Asian and African countries which request such aid. This was the case with Angola and Ethiopia. The same thing is happening today in Afghanistan where imperialism has unleashed a true undeclared war, simultaneously creating a direct threat to the security of the southern border of the USSR. In full conformity with the UN Charter, the Soviet Union has rendered military assistance which a friendly country requested.

I think that it would not be out of place to recollect the tragic developments of 1967-1970 in Nigeria when the existence of a strong and united Nigerian state was put to test. The policy of the Soviet Union, which is a sincere supporter of unity and cohesion in Africa and the opponent of imperialist designs of its "Balkanisation", contributed to the historical victory won by the national patriotic forces of Nigeria. As G. Kurubo, the then Nigerian Ambassador to the USSR pointed out in 1968, Nigeria was grateful that from the very beginning, the Soviet Union took a clear-cut, definite stand and supported the Federal Government without waiting to see which side was winning. The courageous, friendly stand of the Soviet Union was beneficial to Nigeria at a most critical period in its history.

From the rostrum of the 26th Congress of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev stated that "the CPSU will consistently continue the policy of promoting cooperation between the USSR and the newly-free countries." The new foreign policy initiatives of the Soviet Union create reliable prerequisites for ameliorating the international situation and, consequently, for the acceleration of socio-economic progress in the young independent states.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1981

CSO: 1812/37

BOOK ANALYZES TIES BETWEEN U.S., PRC, JAPAN

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 81 p 63

Book review by V. Tikhomirov, candidate of Historical Sciences of book "USA-China-Japan: Transformation of Interstate Relations (1969-1979)" by V. M. Mazurov, Moscow, "Nauka" Publishers, 1980, 213 pp

[Text] V. M. MAZUROV, *USA-China-Japan: Transformation of Interstate Relations, (1969-1979)*, Moscow Nauka Publishers, 1980, 213 pp.

Making extensive use of factual material and proceeding from studies by Soviet scholars, the author investigates the evolution of the formation and transformation of interstate relations in the Washington-Peking-Tokyo "triangle" in the 1970s, the period when this process was most intense.

Studying the relations between the three states on the basis of systems analysis, the author describes them as a sort of "subsystem" within the system of international relations as a whole. Such a method makes plain the actual process of mutual adjustments by the sides, their search for a compromise, and the contradictions between the members of this "subsystem", which are often acute and fraught with potential conflict. Nevertheless, Mazurov rightly stresses that at the present stage, and in the foreseeable future, the factors that unite these three states—the desire jointly to resist a further change in the alignment of forces in favour of existing socialism and the continuing development of the national liberation movement—may turn out to be more substantial than the existent growing contradictions.

Anti-Sovietism, it is said in the book, is the principal motivation of the transformation of the earlier existing structure of relations between the three countries. Citing a number of examples, Mazurov shows that at all stages of the period of history under consideration, anti-Sovietism was predominant in the activities of the ruling circles of these countries, influencing

their foreign policy and pushing the USA, Japan and China closer together. In addition the author shows other characteristic features of the ties developing between these three countries. In particular, he disproves the thesis advanced by the ruling circles and propaganda media of these countries, especially of Japan, that the drawing together of the USA, Japan and China has no military overtones and is not opposed to the interests of detente and peaceful coexistence.

Mazurov's book shows that such contentions are untenable. He notes that the concerted measures taken by the three countries have a destabilising impact on the international situation. They are aimed at undermining and weakening the positions of world socialism, suppressing the national liberation movement, in Southeast Asia in particular, and actually, at encouraging Peking's aggressive ambitions. The establishment of the coalition by these states causes mutual influence on each participant and a continuation of the arms race. This is demonstrated irrefutably by the actual consent the imperialist forces gave to China's attack on the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in February 1979, an act which demonstrated the danger of the growing closeness between imperialists and Chinese hegemonists.

Analysing the transformation of interstate relations including the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States, Japan and China, the treaties and agreements of a political, trade, and economic nature concluded between them, as well as their military and political contacts, the author arrives at the conclusion that "by the logic of its development the 'triangle' has approached a more

complex, higher phase of group activity, making it possible to get on with the organisation and integration of some types of production activity" (pp. 160-161).

Mazurov devotes much attention to the nature of the contradictions of interstate relations in the countries under consideration. The reader also sees the acute inter-imperialist contradictions between the US and Japan and each of these countries with other Western states in the struggle for sources of raw materials and markets, including the Chinese market. The author also shows the serious differences between the military-strategic positions of Washington and Tokyo and stresses the inevitable future collision of interests of Washington and Peking which both aspire for world domination.

Actually, the book under review transcends the framework of its stated theme and gives a picture not only of international relations in the region but also of the connection between the foreign and domestic policies of the three states.

It is difficult to expect a book dealing with so many aspects of the problem to be free of shortcomings. They do exist, but they are not substantial in terms of presentation of the theme. I believe that the book would have made more interesting reading had not the author subdivided the period under review into brief stretches of time, this leading to a repetition of some facts. The term "subsystem" used by the author in his study of the process of the formation of ties between the USA, Japan and China is justified in terms of the systems approach employed by the author. At the same time it is fair to expect that the study of this complex and contradictory process of the forming of coalition ties is not confined to this approach but continued on a broader and more multifaceted basis. Last but not least, too many details and too complicated a presentation make reading difficult.

But on the whole, Mazurov's monograph is a considerable contribution to Soviet oriental studies and contains elements of prediction demonstrating the need for further comprehensive studies of problems of international relations.

V. TIKHOMIROV,
Cand. Sc. (Hist.)

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1981

CSO: 1812/37

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

JAN. 25, 1982